

Michael B. Kendis, Dr. J. Shurin, Dr. Thomas M. Conboy, Dr. D. R. Davis, Dr. Lou Ankersen, Dr. M. B. Kanitz, Dr. B. D. Whitehead, Dr. Ray O. Stahl, Dr. John D. G'Sell, Dr. J. Max Daniel, Dr. C. B. Ingram, Dr. J. W. Parker, Dr. H. W. Hagenah, Dr. Buy E. Wend. The resolution was forwarded by Dr. Ray O. Stahl, secretary of the society; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

394. By Mr. COFFEE: Petition adopted by the Sumner-Victory Post, No. 3070, of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, post officers of which are Commander William Castle, Quartermaster Frank E. Cole, and Adjutant Norman Hawkins, urging that the House of Representatives concur in Senate Joint Resolution No. 34, authorizing the President to confer upon William L. Mitchell the posthumous rank of major general, and signed by Messrs. Dean R. Abbott, G. L. Larsen, and Oscar Z. Johanson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

395. By Mr. GOODWIN: Petition of Mrs. Ellen M. Peterson and 12 others of Reading, Mass., being a declaration of principles in the form of a pledge for peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

396. Also, petition of Anita Cerchione, of Stoneham, Mass., and nine others of the Eighth Massachusetts District, members of the Women's Columbus Republican Club of Massachusetts, with reference to the extension of an invitation to Italy to participate in the Conference of Allied Nations at San Francisco; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

397. By Mr. HART: Petition of the Order of Sons of Italy in America, petitioning the President of the United States, (1) To recognize Italy as a full and equal ally; (2) to use his good offices to the end that the United Nations recognize Italy as a full and equal ally; (3) to use his good offices with the sponsoring powers to see to it that Italy be invited forthwith to attend the San Francisco Conference; and (4) to extend lend-lease aid to Italy so that her present economic distress may be relieved by the resumption of industry and production through said aid; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

398. Also, petition of the third ward Democratic committee and associated Democratic clubs of Hoboken, N. J., requesting the United States Government and other Allied Nations to recognize Italy as an ally and invite Italy to the San Francisco Conference; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

399. Also, petition of the Christopher Columbus Memorial Committee of Hoboken, N. J., requesting the United States Government and other Allied Nations to recognize Italy as an ally and invite Italy to the San Francisco Conference; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

400. Also, petition of New Jersey State Legislature (Senate Joint Resolution 10), memorializing Congress to provide a veterans' general medical and surgical hospital in the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

401. By Mr. KEOGH: Petition of residents of the Ninth Congressional District of Brooklyn with reference to the recognition of Italy as an ally; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

402. By The SPEAKER: Petition of the city of Los Angeles, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to have an investigation made of the housing shortage in that city; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

403. Also, petition of Polish-American Congress, New Hampshire Division, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to condemnation of partition of Poland according to decisions of the Crimean Conference and requesting adherence to the principles of the Atlantic Charter; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

404. Also, petition of American Legion post of the Capital City Business and Professional Men's Post, No. 316, Austin, Tex., petitioning

consideration of their resolution with reference to the establishment of a world organization possessed of the authority to maintain peace throughout the world, using force against aggressor nations if necessary; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

405. Also, petition of the American Legion, Eagle Post No. 211, Eagle Pass, Tex., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the establishment of a world organization possessed of the authority to maintain peace throughout the world, using force against aggressor nations if necessary; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

406. Also, petition of the Democratic Party of Guatemala, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to expression of deep sympathy on the death of our late President, Franklin D. Roosevelt; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

407. Also, petition of the Middletown Civil Club, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the establishment of a national holiday on January 30, in memory of our late President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

408. Also, petition of the council of the city of Los Angeles, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the speedy passage of H. R. 2071, a bill affecting the salaries of postal workers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

409. Also, petition of Lebanese residents of Puerto Rico, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to expressing sympathy in regard to the loss of our late President; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

410. Also, petition of National University Committee of Burrell D. Hodges, Detachment Marine Corps League, Norfolk, Va., and of the National Defense Committee, Old Dominion Post, No. 67, American Legion, Norfolk, Va., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the establishment of a national university as a permanent utilitarian monument; to the Committee on Education.

411. Mr. HAND: Petition of the Cumberland County License Beverage Association of New Jersey with 5,000 signatures, protesting against the enactment of House bill 2082, and other prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## SENATE

THURSDAY, APRIL 19, 1945

(Legislative day of Monday, April 16, 1945)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God our Father, we would make our hearts, cleansed by Thy forgiving grace, a temple of Thy presence, knowing that only to the pure dost Thou grant the vision of Thy face. We come asking, not that Thou wouldst give heed to the faltering petitions our lips frame but that Thou wilt bend Thine ear to the crying of our deep need. We bring to the altar of prayer our inmost selves, cluttered and confused, where good and evil, the petty and the great, are so entwined. May the eternal immensities shame our little thoughts and ways. May the vision of what we might be convict us of what we are. In this great day of Thy visitation, may we miss not the things belonging to our peace and to the peace of the world. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Wednesday, April 18, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

## MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 37. An act to amend sections 4, 7, and 17 of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187) for the purpose of extending the time in which amendatory contracts may be made, and for other related purposes;

S. 288. An act for the relief of the Lawrence Motor Co., Inc.;

S. 514. An act for the relief of the Baldwin Bros. Paving Co.;

S. 530. An act authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant an easement in certain lands of the Veterans' Administration, Dallas, Tex., to Dallas County, Tex., for highway purposes; and

S. 531. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to transfer by quitclaim deed to the city of Los Angeles, Calif., for fire-station purposes, the title to certain land located at Veterans' Administration facility, Los Angeles, Calif.

## CURTAILMENT OF FEDERAL BUREAUCRACY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, individuals learn in life that the applicability of rules in human activity changes with time, circumstance, and condition. A great Democrat, Grover Cleveland, set forth what he thought was a definite policy ingrained in the Constitution when he said in substance that it was the business of the people to support the Government and not for the Government to support the people.

Yet, after his time, conditions changed, and we modified that rule in our practice to the extent of permitting Government, in times of great national emergency, to do even that which Grover Cleveland said it should not do. When the world depression came upon us, the Government of the United States, acting as the agent of the people—because of the united strength of all of us—engaged in palliative measures. Then the great war came upon us and the people through their Government did the impossible. Latent qualities were rediscovered in our people; inventive genius, untiring energy went into action. But bureaucracy, which had undergone a necessary growth during the period of palliative measures, extended itself out of all proportion to military necessity during the war period.

The people of this country will, in the post-war period, find themselves in the exact opposite condition to that in which they found themselves during the period of the palliative measures. Now our people, as individuals and organizations,

possess some \$250,000,000,000 worth of United States bonds. Bank deposits are more than \$140,000,000,000. Our people have saved in excess of \$100,000,000,000 since Pearl Harbor. Money is looking for investment.

Now we are in a position with our tremendous backlog of demand really "to go to town." We have the economic resources; we have a trained labor corps; we have reborn confidence, renewed courage, and reinvigorated faith to explore and build and create. And finding ourselves in this position, we see no reason why we, the people, should not say to these bureaucrats who would now want to interfere with our economic rebirth, "Get thee behind us."

We observe that these bureaucrats who came into existence during the palliative years and the war emergency are impressed with the notion that they should remain on the job and the boss of the job. As in Russia in the years of the Czar, these bureaucrats are proving a hindrance to progress. Many of them in their time and season did a worthwhile job. But now they are no longer needed. Conditions and circumstances have indeed changed.

It is in the light of this dynamic change of circumstances that I respectfully suggest that now is the opportune time for Congress and President Truman to curb and curtail the Federal bureaucracy. To do so would give a shot in the arm to the American public. Through the saving of a billion dollars in the Federal Budget our people would be impressed with the fact that efficiency and economy had once more become the order of the day and that the extravagant Federal overhead was on its way down. Congress for its own part in the forthcoming Budget should take the ax to the bureaucratic organizations which have outlived their usefulness and which will be detrimental to our national growth during the post-war period. And President Truman, I am hopeful, will give a directive to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget along the lines I have mentioned.

#### THE LATE PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT'S LEADERSHIP IN SOCIAL-WELFARE LEGISLATION

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, tributes to the memory of our late beloved President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, are still pouring in from all over the world. From persons in every walk of life comes the recognition of his leadership in the tasks of winning the war, his great qualities as Commander in Chief, his vision and courage as a statesman in preparing for the peace.

Those of us who worked closely with Franklin D. Roosevelt during his 35 years in public life also remember his leadership against the peacetime perils of a Nation "ill-housed, ill-clad, ill-fed." The people of our land and of nations throughout the world stood united behind him in war because they knew that in peace he had never ceased to fight for the freedom, welfare, and dignity of the common man, for justice and opportunity for all, regardless of race, creed, or color.

Among the many lasting monuments in which the memory of Franklin D.

Roosevelt is enshrined is the great humanitarian and social legislation he sponsored. Over 16 years ago he said in his speech accepting the nomination for Governor of New York:

In social legislation, in education, in health, in better housing, in the care of the aged, we have gone far, but we must go farther.

Nearly 11 years ago, on June 8, 1934, he sent to Congress his famous message dealing with social-security legislation. Then he said:

Among our objectives, I place the security of the men, women, and children of the Nation first.

To the attainment of that goal he gave his heart and mind throughout his service to the people, first as Governor of New York State, then as our President and Commander in Chief.

This year commemorates the tenth anniversary of the adoption of the Social Security Act, which provides a foundation on which our country has begun to build into reality some of the vision he held for the American people. Just a few months ago Franklin D. Roosevelt had stated that he intended to recommend to the Congress improvements in existing social-security legislation to help ease the transition from war to peace.

During recent years I have carefully kept a record of the speeches and statements of Franklin D. Roosevelt on social security, health, and welfare matters. His words will be a source of inspiration to those who intend to carry on the good things which he helped to start.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include as a part of my remarks excerpts on social security and health from the speeches and statements of Franklin D. Roosevelt, to record the lasting debt we owe to him for his leadership and for the aspirations he left with us for fulfillment.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1928: "In social legislation, in education, in health, in better housing, in the care of the aged, we have gone far, but we must go farther." (Acceptance of nomination for Governor of New York, October 16, 1928.)

1928: "We pledge a consideration of the subject of old-age pensions \* \* \* I believe that the time is definitely at hand for the State of New York to give definite study to the great humanitarian question of preventing destitution among the thousands of our citizens who become too old to maintain for themselves the adequate standards of life to which as Americans they are entitled.

"We pledge \* \* \* the further liberalization of the laws relating to the welfare of mothers and children." (Campaign address, Buffalo, N. Y., October 20, 1928.)

1928: "We need an expansion of medical service to every out-of-the-way corner in the cities and on the farms.

"We need a drastic revision of the poor laws, \* \* \* this State can, as I believe it will, pass a proper and adequate old-age pension law." (Campaign address, Rochester, N. Y., October 23, 1928.)

1929: "New social conditions bring new ideas of social responsibility. The problem of how to take care of the aged poor outside of State institutions is now occupying the attention of other States of the Union as well

as of foreign countries. We can no longer be satisfied with the old method of putting them away in dismal institutions with the accompanying loss of self-respect, personality, and interest in life.

"This State abandoned some time ago the principle of institutional care for poor children, and adopted the method of helping them in their own homes. Similar provision should be made for old age." (Governor Roosevelt recommends the creation of a commission to study the problem of old-age assistance, February 28, 1929.)

1930: "Then there is another very important matter, and that is our public health. It is becoming increasingly apparent that illness is a thing which can be prevented as well as cured. There is much sound common sense in the traditional Chinese method of paying the doctor for the days you are well, instead of for the days that you are sick." (An address before the State Charities Aid Association, New York City, January 17, 1930.)

1930: "I look forward to the time when every young man and young woman entering industrial or agricultural or business activity will begin to insure himself or herself against the privations of old age. The premiums which that young man or young girl will pay should be supplemented by premiums to be paid by the employers of the State, as well as by the State itself. In that way, when the young man or young girl has grown to old and dependent age, he or she will have built up an insurance fund which will maintain them in comfort in their years of reduced activity. In this way, their assistance will be a result of their own efforts and foresightedness. They will be receiving not charity, but the natural profits of their years of labor and insurance. I hope to have the opportunity of continuing my efforts to obtain this kind of old-age insurance which our most progressive thought demands." (Campaign address, Rochester, N. Y., October 21, 1930.)

1931: "Our American aged do not want charity, but rather old-age comforts to which they are rightfully entitled by their own thrift and foresight in the form of insurance. It is, therefore, my judgment that the next step to be taken should be based on the theory of insurance by a system of contributions commencing at an early age. In this way all men and women will, on arriving at a period when work is no longer practicable, be assured not merely of a roof overhead and enough food to keep body and soul together, but also enough income to maintain life during the balance of their days in accordance with the American standard of living." (The annual message to the legislature, January 7, 1931.)

1931: "The success or failure of any government in the final analysis must be measured by the well-being of its citizens. Nothing can be more important to a State than its public health; the State's paramount concern should be the health of its people." (The Governor transmits to the legislature a report of the special health commission, February 19, 1931.)

1931: "What impresses me most is that insurance as a whole is a constantly changing and a constantly growing force in our individual lives and in our business lives. As the world becomes more and more civilized and stabilized we are able to give protection against more and more forms of potential dangers or losses. That is why I have at all times been so ready to go along with new forms of insurance to meet new needs. In other words, I have been a consistent opponent of the school which takes the position that because a new form of risk has never been written before it should not be undertaken in the future."

"I use this example of unemployment insurance because I am certain in my own mind that what is now an experiment affecting about 100,000 workers in this country



will become the universal practice throughout the country during the coming generation." (Address on unemployment insurance, New York City, March 6, 1931.)

1931: "The sole method of relief for unemployment is not only repugnant to all sound principles of social economics, but is contrary to every principle of American citizenship and of sound government. American labor seeks no charity, but only a chance to work for its living. The relief which the workers of the State should be able to anticipate, when engulfed in a period of industrial depression, should be one of insurance, to which they themselves have in a large part contributed. Each industry itself should likewise bear a part of the premium for this insurance, and the State, in the interest of its own citizens." (A recommendation for a commission to investigate unemployment insurance, March 25, 1931.)

1931: "One of these duties of the State is that of caring for those of its citizens who find themselves the victims of such adverse circumstances as makes them unable to obtain even the necessities for mere existence without the aid of others. That responsibility is recognized by every civilized nation."

"While it is true that we have hitherto principally considered those who through accident or old age were permanently incapacitated, the same responsibility of the State undoubtedly applies when widespread economic conditions render large numbers of men and women incapable of supporting either themselves or their families because of circumstances beyond their control which make it impossible for them to find remunerative labor. To these unfortunate citizens aid must be extended by Government—not as a matter of charity but as a matter of social duty." (Message of Gov. Franklin D. Roosevelt to the New York Legislature on relief policy, August 28, 1931.)

1932: "In January 1929 I suggested an immediate study of the problem of the security of elderly people against want, and in 1930 a special legislative committee made a report and recommendations thereon. I had hoped that their recommendations would include a plan by which a contributory system would be set up in addition to taking care of our present old people. It was my thought that in this way the financial burden on localities and on the State would, while at first heavy, be greatly reduced over a period of years through the coming into operation of an annuity fund built up in large part by contributions made during the working years of the individual citizens." (The annual message to the legislature, January 6, 1932.)

1934: "Fear and worry based on unknown danger contribute to social unrest and economic demoralization. If, as our Constitution tells us, our Federal Government was established among other things 'to promote the general welfare,' it is our plain duty to provide for that security upon which welfare depends."

"These three great objectives—the security of the home, the security of livelihood, and the security of social insurance—are, it seems to me, a minimum of the promise that we can offer to the American people. They constitute a right which belongs to every individual and every family willing to work. They are the essential fulfillment of measures already taken toward relief, recovery, and reconstruction."

"This seeking for a greater measure of welfare and happiness does not indicate a change in values. It is rather a return to values lost in the course of our economic development and expansion." (Message from President Roosevelt to the Congress, June 8, 1934.)

1934: "We seek the security of the men, women, and children of the Nation."

"To use the agencies of Government to assist in the establishment of means to provide sound and adequate protection against the

vicissitudes of modern life—in other words, social insurance." (The first fireside chat of 1934, June 28, 1934.)

1934: "Let it be well remembered that the hundreds of thousands of men and women and children to whom I have referred, scattered throughout our Nation, have no splendid hospitals for their care, have no medical attention, \* \* \* have no opportunities for adequate education, and can but suffer the ills of their lives according to their own individual circumstances."

"We must do first things first. The care of the disabled, the sick, the destitute, and the starving in all ranks of our population—that, my friends, is the first thing." (Dedication of veterans' hospital, October 19, 1934.)

1934: "There is also the problem of economic loss due to sickness—a very serious matter for many families with and without incomes, and therefore, an unfair burden upon the medical profession. Whether we come to this form of insurance soon or later on, I am confident that we can devise a system which will enhance and not hinder the remarkable progress which has been made and is being made in the practice of the professions of medicine and surgery in the United States." (Address to Advisory Council of the Committee on Economic Security on the Problems of Economic and Social Security, November 14, 1934.)

1935: "Closely related to the broad problem of livelihood is that of security against the major hazards of life. Here also a comprehensive survey of what has been attempted or accomplished in many nations and in many States proves to me that the time has come for action by the National Government. I shall send to you in a few days definite recommendations based on these studies. These recommendations will cover the broad subjects of unemployment insurance and old-age insurance, of benefits for children, for mothers, for the handicapped, for maternity care, and for other aspects of dependency and illness where a beginning can now be made." (Message to the Congress of the United States, January 4, 1935.)

1935: "The establishment of sound means toward a greater future economic security of the American people is dictated by a prudent consideration of the hazards involved in our national life. No one can guarantee this country against the dangers of future depressions but we can reduce these dangers. We can eliminate many of the factors that cause economic depressions, and we can provide the means of mitigating their results. This plan for economic security is at once a measure of prevention and a method of alleviation." (Message of President Roosevelt transmitting social-security recommendations, January 17, 1935.)

1935: "This law, too, represents a cornerstone in a structure which is built but is by no means complete—a structure intended to lessen the force of possible future depressions, to act as a protection to future administrations of the Government against the necessity of going deeply into debt to furnish relief to the needy—a law to flatten out the peaks and valleys of deflation and of inflation—in other words, a law that will take care of human needs and at the same time provide for the United States an economic structure of vastly greater soundness." (Statement by President Roosevelt upon signing the social-security bill, August 14, 1935.)

1935: "While the amounts provided in the act do not give the amount of insurance and protection which I should like to see, it is a definite beginning along the proper road. It is a step which should have been taken in America a generation ago as it has been taken in other countries. \* \* \*

"It is the foundation upon which we hope in America to provide a real form of financial security for workers, so that the specter of unemployment and old-age destitution may be banished from the American home

and farm." (Statement included as a note in the public papers of Franklin D. Roosevelt commenting on a statement issued upon signing the Social Security Act, August 14, 1935.)

1938: "The enactment of the Social Security Act marked a great advance in affording more equitable and effective protection to the people of this country against widespread and growing economic hazards. The successful operation of the act is the best proof that it was soundly conceived. However, it would be unfortunate if we assumed that it was complete and final. Rather, we should be constantly seeking to perfect and strengthen it in the light of our accumulating experience and growing appreciation of social needs." (Public letter to Chairman of the Social Security Board recommending liberalizing the old-age insurance system, April 28, 1938.)

1938: "I am also confident that each year will bring further development in Federal and State social security legislation—and that is as it should be. \* \* \*

"We have come a long way. But we still have a long way to go. There is still today a frontier that remains unconquered—an America unreclaimed. This is the great, the Nation-wide frontier of insecurity, of human want and fear. This is the frontier—the America—we have set ourselves to reclaim." (Radio address on the third anniversary of the Social Security Act, August 15, 1938.)

1939: "All of us want better provision for our older people under our social-security legislation. For the medically needy we must provide better care." (Annual message to the Congress, January 4, 1939.)

1939: "We have a right to be proud of the progress we have made in the short time the Social Security Act has been in operation. However, we would be derelict in our responsibility if we did not take advantage of the experience we have accumulated to strengthen and extend its provisions. \* \* \*

"I cannot too strongly urge the wisdom of building upon the principles contained in the present Social Security Act in affording greater protection to our people rather than turning to untried and demonstrably unsound panaceas. \* \* \*

"We shall make the most orderly progress if we look upon social security as a development toward a goal rather than a finished product." (Message to Congress from President Roosevelt, January 16, 1939, concerning amendments to the Social Security Act, 1939.)

1939: "I have been concerned by the evidence of inequalities that exist among the States as to personnel and facilities for health services. There are equally serious inequalities of resources, medical facilities and services in different sections and among different economic groups. These inequalities create handicaps for the parts of our country and the groups of our people which most sorely need the benefits of modern medical science."

"The objective of a national health program is to make available in all parts of our country and for all groups of our people the scientific knowledge and skill at our command to prevent and care for sickness and disability; to safeguard mothers, infants, and children; and to offset through social insurance the loss of earnings among workers who are temporarily or permanently disabled." (Message to Congress on the national health program, January 23, 1939.)

1939: "It will be exactly 4 years ago on the fourteenth of this month that I signed the original Social Security Act. As I indicated at that time and on various occasions since that time, we must expect a great program of social legislation such as is represented in the Social Security Act to be improved and strengthened in the light of additional experience and understanding. These amendments to the act represent another tremendous step forward in providing greater se-

curity for the people of this country." (Statement by the President on August 11, 1939, on signing the Social Security Act amendments of 1939.)

1940: "There is still need for the Federal Government to participate in strengthening and increasing the health security of the Nation. \* \* \*

"In order that at least a beginning may be done, I now propose for the consideration of the Congress a program for the construction of small hospitals in needy areas of the country, especially in rural areas, not now provided with them. Hospitals are essential to physicians in giving modern medical service to the people. In many areas present hospital facilities are almost nonexistent. The most elementary health needs are not being met." (Message to the Congress recommending the construction of hospitals in needy areas of the country without such facilities, January 30, 1940.)

1940: "We are still, however, quite distant from the objective which we seek—the security and the high standards of living for every man, woman, and child which the resources and manpower of America makes possible. \* \* \*

"Our progress must continue to be a steady and deliberate one—we cannot stand still, we cannot slip back. We must look forward to certain definite things in the near future. For example, the benefits of social security should be broadened and extended; unemployment insurance should cover a larger number of workers. Our old-age pension system must be improved and extended; the amount of the pension should be increased, and, above all, these pensions must be given in a manner which will respect the dignity of the life of service and labor which our aged citizens have given to the Nation. \* \* \*

"There is nothing in our present emergency to justify a retreat from any of our social objectives—conservation of resources, assistance to agriculture, housing, and help to the underprivileged." (Speech by President Roosevelt to the Teamsters Union, September 11, 1940.)

1940: "The social gains of recent years, including insurance and other benefit rights, must be preserved unimpaired. \* \* \*

"I recommend to the Congress early consideration of the problems thus recognized, and enactment of the necessary legislation incident to preserving insurance protection under the Social Security Act." (President Roosevelt's message to the Congress, September 14, 1940.)

1941: "There is, of course, still room for improvement in our social-security system. I have repeatedly recommended that it be extended to cover many of the occupations now specifically exempted under the act. Also, the health provisions of the Social Security Act are now inadequate to cover the costs of medical care and provide for temporary or permanent disability." (Statement included as a note in the public papers of Franklin D. Roosevelt commenting on a radio address of 1938.)

1941: "I recommend the continuance in full measure of the social-security programs. This includes not only the payment of old-age benefits as required by law but also aid to youth and continued payments toward the State aid of old persons not covered by the insurance benefits: aids to children and to the physically handicapped. \* \* \*

"Furthermore, I deem it vital that the Congress give consideration to the inclusion in the old-age and survivors insurance system and the unemployment compensation system of workers not now covered." (Budget message for the fiscal year 1942, January 3, 1941.)

1941: "Many subjects connected with our social economy call for immediate improvement. As examples:

"We should bring more citizens under the coverage of old-age pensions and unemployment insurance.

"We should widen the opportunities for adequate medical care.

"We should plan a better system by which persons deserving or needing gainful employment may obtain it." (Message to Congress on the state of the Union, January 6, 1941.)

1941: "They (the President and the Prime Minister) desire to bring about the fullest collaboration between all nations in the economic field, with the object of securing for all improved labor standards, economic advancement and social security." (Atlantic Charter, August 1941.)

1942: "I oppose the use of pay-roll taxes as a measure of war finance unless the worker is given his full money's worth in increased social security. From the inception of the social security program in 1935 it has been planned to increase the number of persons covered and to provide protection against hazards not initially included. By expanding the program now, we advance the organic development of our social security system and at the same time contribute to the anti-inflationary program.

"I recommend an increase in the coverage of old-age and survivors' insurance, addition of permanent and temporary disability payments, and hospitalization payments beyond the present benefit programs, and liberalization and expansion of unemployment compensation in a uniform national system. I suggest that collection of additional contributions be started as soon as possible, to be followed 1 year later by the operation of the new benefit plans.

"Additional employer and employee contributions will cover increased disbursements over a long period of time. Increased contributions would result in reserves of several billion dollars for post-war contingencies. The present accumulation of these contributions would absorb excess purchasing power. Investment of the additional reserves in bonds of the United States Government would assist in financing the war.

"The existing administrative machinery for collecting pay-roll taxes can function immediately. For this reason congressional consideration might be given to immediate enactment of this proposal, while other necessary measures are being perfected." (Budget message of the President to the Congress, January 5, 1942.)

1942: "I am convinced that the best solution of the problem would be a uniform national system of unemployment insurance with adequate benefit provisions." (Letter of the President to Speaker RAYBURN, January 19, 1942.)

1942: "This is the time to strengthen, not to weaken, the social-security system. It is time now to prepare for the security of workers in the post-war years. \* \* \* This is one case in which social and fiscal objectives, war and post-war aims are in full accord. Expanded social security, together with other fiscal measures, would set up a bulwark of economic security for the people now and after the war and at the same time would provide anti-inflationary sources for financing the war." (President Roosevelt in letter to Senator George, October 3, 1942.)

1943: "When you talk with our young men and women, you will find that with the opportunity for employment they want assurance against the evils of all major economic hazards—assurance that will extend from the cradle to the grave. This great Government can and must provide this assurance.

"I have been told that this is no time to speak of a better America after the war. I am told it is a grave error on my part.

"I dissent.

"If the security of the individual citizen, or the family, should become a subject of national debate, the country knows where I stand." (President Roosevelt's message to Congress, January 7, 1943.)

1943: "We fight today for security for our Nation and at the same time we can endeavor to give our citizens and their families security against attacks from without, and against fear of economic distress in old age, in poverty, sickness, involuntary unemployment, and accidental injuries. We need to look forward to the accomplishment of these objectives—world peace, democratic society, and a dynamic economy.

"Because of their basic importance to our national welfare during the war and after the war, it is my earnest hope that the Congress will give these matters full consideration during this session. We must not return to the inequities, insecurity, and fears of the past, but ought to move forward toward the promise of the future." (Transmitting to Congress two reports of the National Resources Planning Board, March 10, 1943.)

1943: "Among many other things, we are today laying plans for the return to civilian life of our gallant men and women in the armed services. They must not be demobilized into an environment of inflation and unemployment, to a place on a bread line or on a corner selling apples. We must this time have plans ready, instead of waiting to do a hasty, inefficient, and ill-considered job at the last moment.

"But the members of the armed forces have been compelled to make greater economic sacrifice and every other kind of sacrifice than the rest of us, and are entitled to definite action to help take care of their special problems.

"The least to which they are entitled, it seems to me, is something like this:

"1. Mustering-out pay to every member of the armed forces and merchant marine when he or she is honorably discharged, large enough in each case to cover a reasonable period of time between his discharge and the finding of a new job.

"2. In case no job is found after diligent search, then unemployment insurance if the individual registers with the United States Employment Service.

"3. An opportunity for members of the armed services to get further education or trade training at the cost of their Government.

"4. Allowance of credit to all members of the armed forces, under unemployment compensation and Federal old-age and survivors' insurance, for their period of service. For these purposes they should be treated as if they had continued their employment in private industry." (Radio address, July 28, 1943.)

1943: "It happens that today is also the anniversary of the day in 1935 when our own American Social Security Act became law.

"That humanitarian law made a real beginning toward the abolition of want in this country. More than 60,000,000 workers with their own contributions are building security for their old age and for their families in case of death. Several million are already enjoying benefits. However, in all fairness, and in all equity, we should extend these benefits to farmers, farm laborers, small businessmen, and others working for themselves or in occupations specifically excluded by law. We should extend social security to provide protection against the serious economic hazard of ill health." (Statement on the second anniversary of the signing of the Atlantic Charter, August 14, 1943.)



1943: "As the war grows tougher and as new problems constantly arise in our domestic economy, changes in methods and changes in legislation may become necessary.

"We should move for the greater economic protection of our returning men and women in the armed forces and for greater educational opportunities for them. And for all our citizens we should provide a further measure of social security in order to protect them against certain continuing hazards of life.

"All these things, as well as eventual demobilization, should be studied now, and much of the necessary legislation should be enacted. I do not mean that this statement should be regarded in any way as an intimation that we are approaching the end of the war. Such an intimation could not be based either on fact or on reason. But when the war ends, we do not want to be caught again without planning or legislation, such as occurred at the end of the last war.

"On all these, and on other subjects, I expect to communicate with this Congress from time to time." (President Roosevelt's message to Congress, September 17, 1943.)

1944: "Last July I recommended to the Congress a minimum program to assist service men and service women in meeting some of the problems they will face when discharged. This included mustering-out pay for every member of the armed forces sufficient to provide for a reasonable period after discharge. I also urged an educational and training program to enable those demobilized from the armed forces to further their education and training and to prepare for peacetime employment. I am confident that the Congress will take early action along these lines.

"The permanent program of social security initially adopted in 1935 provides a framework within which many of the problems of demobilization can be met. This framework of unemployment insurance and retirement benefits must be reinforced and extended so that we shall be better equipped for readjustment of the labor force and for the demobilization of the armed forces and civilian war workers.

"Pressing economic need has forced many workers to continue in employment or seek work even when disability, old age, or care of young children would have made retirement from the labor force preferable. Extension at the present time of the coverage of the Federal old-age and survivors' insurance system to many groups now denied protection and expansion of the scope of the system to include disability benefits would permit these workers to retire after the war. The old-age and survivors' insurance system should also be amended to give those in the armed forces credit for the period of their military service.

"The proposed changes in the social-security law would provide the necessary minimum protection for nearly all individuals and their families, including veterans of the present war. They would provide benefits additional to veterans' pensions, veterans' compensation, and national service life insurance in case of death or disability attributable to military service.

"I repeat my recommendation that the present unemployment insurance system be strengthened so that we shall be able to provide the necessary protection to the millions of workers who may be affected by reconversion of industry. I prefer an extension of coverage and liberalization of unemployment benefits to any special legislation, such as that providing for dismissal payments through war contractors. I also recommend the adoption of a program of Federal unemployment allowance for members of the armed forces. Furthermore, I suggest

Congress consider the establishment of unemployment insurance for maritime employees and a temporary system of unemployment allowances for those in Federal service who, because of their wartime employment, have been unable to build up rights under the existing system."

"I earnestly urge the Congress to retain at this time the scheduled increase in rates. High employment and low rates of retirement during the war have added to social-insurance reserves. However, liabilities for future benefits based on the increased wartime employment and wages have risen concurrently. The increase in contributions provided by existing law should now become effective so that the contributions will be more nearly in accord with the value of the insurance provided and so that reserves may be built up to aid in financing future benefit payments." (Budget message for the fiscal year 1945, January 10, 1944.)

1944: "We have come to a clear realization of the fact that true individual freedom cannot exist without economic security and independence. 'Necessitous men are not free men.' People who are hungry and out of a job are the stuff of which dictatorships are made.

"In our day these economic truths have become accepted as self-evident. We have accepted, so to speak, a second Bill of Rights under which a new basis of security and prosperity can be established for all—regardless of station, race, or creed.

"Among these are:

"The right to adequate medical care and the opportunity to achieve and enjoy good health.

"The right to adequate protection from the economic fears of old age, sickness, accident, and unemployment." (Annual message to Congress, January 11, 1944.)

1944: "The public will understand that as a nation we are committed to social security and will undoubtedly increase and not decrease its benefits. Already some other nations have a larger degree of social security than we." (President's statement on signing H. R. 5564, "An act to fix the tax under the Federal Insurance Contributions Act on employer and employees for calendar year 1945," December 16, 1944.)

1945: "I hope that the Congress will give early consideration to extension and improvement of our social-security system and will reexamine the financial basis of the program.

"I have already emphasized the need to strengthen our social-security program. With respect to the reconversion period, I am particularly concerned over the fact that broad categories of workers are not covered by present legislation and that present standards for unemployment compensation are not adequate in many States. To promote employment opportunities and to assure the proper occupational adjustment of returning veterans and war workers, a strong, integrated system of public employment offices is a basic necessity. We can best accomplish this objective by the establishment, through permanent legislation, of an effective national employment service with adequate coverage throughout the Nation. For the reconversion period we should provide assistance for travel and retraining of war workers.

"Our program should include provision for extended social security, including medical care, for better education, public health, and nutrition; for the improvement of our homes,

cities, and farms; and for the development of transportation facilities and river valleys." (Budget message of the President to the Congress, January 3, 1945.)

1945: "In turn, others of the economic rights of American citizenship, such as the right to a decent home, to a good education, to good medical care, to social security, to reasonable farm income, will, if fulfilled, make major contributions to achieving adequate levels of employment.

"An expanded social-security program and adequate health and education programs must play essential roles in a program designed to support individual productivity and mass purchasing power. I shall communicate further with the Congress on these subjects at a later date." (President's message on the state of the Union, January 6, 1945.)

#### DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Finance:

"Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to include under the provisions of the Social Security Act individual employers of employees covered by said act

"Whereas the provisions of the Social Security Act pertain only to certain employees; and

"Whereas individual employers while contributing to the social-security fund for the benefit of such employees, receive no benefits for themselves; and

"Whereas it is only just and equitable that such employers should be entitled to the benefits of the Social Security Act: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the Senate and General Assembly of the State of New Jersey:

"1. That the Congress of the United States be memorialized and urged to take immediate action to include under the provisions of the Social Security Act the individual employers of those employees already covered by said act.

"2. The Secretary of State is directed to transmit copies of this joint resolution, properly authenticated, to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, to the Clerk of the House of Representatives and to each Member of the Senate and House of Representatives from the State of New Jersey.

"3. This joint resolution shall take effect immediately."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

"Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to prevent counties, cities, or other subdivisions of any State from imposing income, wage, or other similar taxes upon nonresidents of such State

"Whereas the city of Philadelphia now levies a tax upon wages; and

"Whereas many residents of New Jersey are employed in the city of Philadelphia and are required to pay this tax to the city of Philadelphia, resulting in inequities to many residents of the State of New Jersey, especially those residing in the southern counties of our State: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and General Assembly of the State of New Jersey:

"1. That the Congress of the United States is memorialized to enact legislation to prevent counties, cities, or other subdivisions of any State from imposing income, wage, and other similar taxes upon nonresidents of such State.

"2. The secretary of state is directed to transmit copies of this joint resolution, properly authenticated, to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, to the Clerk of the House of Representatives and to each Member of the Senate and House of Representatives from the State of New Jersey.

"3. This joint resolution shall take effect immediately."

A resolution adopted by the city council of the city of Cambridge, Mass., favoring the enactment of the so-called merchant seamen's bill of rights legislation; to the Committee on Commerce.

The petition of the Woman's Auxiliary, New Providence Presbyterian Church, Mofatts Creek, Va., favoring the establishment of a Christian world order and government; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

#### RETIREMENT OF SERVICEMEN AFTER 25 YEARS' SERVICE

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD a resolution adopted by Edward C. Call Post, No. 285, the American Legion, Department of Indiana, favoring amendment to the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, in such manner that all former servicemen who are suffering from service-connected disabilities amounting to 10 percent or more may be retired after 25 years of service, regardless of age, and so forth.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the resolution will be received, appropriately referred, and printed in the RECORD.

To the Committee on Civil Service:

Wherefore it is a matter of common knowledge that former servicemen who have sustained service-connected disabilities amounting to 10 percent or more do not generally live the average length of life allotted to other citizens who have not experienced the hardships of military and naval service; and

Whereas the Civil Service Act of May 29, 1930, as amended to March 7, 1942, provided that civil-service employees may retire after they have attained the age of 60 years and have been civil-service employees for a period of 30 years: Now be it

Resolved by Edward C. Call Post, No. 285, the American Legion, Department of Indiana, That the said Civil Service Act heretofore referred to be amended in such manner that all former servicemen who are suffering with service-connected disabilities amount-

ing to 10 percent or more may be retired after 25 years of service, regardless of age, on the same compensation and retirement pay as other civil-service employees who may retire after having served 30 years as civil-service employees; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to each of the United States Senators and each of the Members of the House of Representatives from the State of Indiana who are now serving in the Congress of the United States.

FRANK M. MARTIN,  
CHARLES W. CHAMBERS,  
AUSTIN ROYER,

Committee on Resolution.

The above resolution was adopted by Edward C. Call Post, No. 285, the American Legion, in regular meeting held on the 13th day of February 1945.

Attest:

BERNARD B. BURKS,  
Commander.  
ROLAND W. MINICH,  
Adjutant.

The above resolution, adopted by Edward C. Call Post, No. 285, the American Legion, was adopted by the Seventh Indiana District of the American Legion, Department of Indiana in a meeting held at Franklin, Ind., on the 25th day of March 1945.

Attest:

BYRON V. HOOVER,  
Commander, Seventh Indiana District.  
FLOYD H. GRIGSBY,  
Acting Adjutant.

#### PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR ADVERTISEMENTS OVER THE RADIO AND IN THE PRESS

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received a petition from Lee Ralph Phipps, pastor of the Methodist Church, Townville, Pa., informing me that he and the members of his church, 250 in number, are heartily in favor of Senate bill 599, introduced by me, to stop all liquor advertising. I ask unanimous consent to present the petition and that it be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the petition will be received, appropriately referred, and printed in the RECORD.

To the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

TOWNVILLE, PA., March 27, 1945.

MY DEAR MR. CAPPER: My church, including 230 members on last Sunday unanimously instructed me to write you assuring you of our hearty support in your bill for the stopping of liquor advertisements over the radio and in the press. There are no justifying reasons for permitting this but a great many valid reasons why it should be prevented. We are asking you to communicate our request to our representatives in Congress, either personally or upon the floor.

Yours fraternally,

LEE RALPH PHIPPS,  
Pastor, Methodist Church.

#### REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

H. R. 689. A bill to enable the Department of State, pursuant to its responsibilities under the Constitution and statutes of the United States, more effectively to carry out its prescribed and traditional responsibilities in the foreign field; to strengthen the Foreign Service permitting the fullest utilization of available personnel and facilities of

other departments and agencies and coordination of activities abroad of the United States under a Foreign Service for the United States unified under the guidance of the Department of State; without amendment (Rept. No. 192).

#### HOSPITAL CENTER IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, I ask unanimous consent to report favorably with an amendment the bill (S. 223) to provide for the establishment of a modern, adequate, and efficient hospital center in the District of Columbia, and I submit a report (No. 193) thereon. This represents hearings intermittently taken during the last 18 months, and I am hopeful that Senators may find time to read the report when it is printed and familiarize themselves as much as the report and the testimony will permit with the hospital conditions in the District, which need serious correction.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be received and the bill placed on the calendar.

#### BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BILBO:

S. 899. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to create a revenue in the District of Columbia by levying a tax upon all dogs therein, to make such dogs personal property, and for other purposes," approved June 19, 1878, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GURNEY:

S. 900. A bill to provide that service as a cadet, midshipman, or aviation cadet shall be credited for pay purposes, and that service as a cadet or midshipman shall be credited for retirement purposes, in the case of military and naval personnel; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHIPSTEAD:

S. 901. A bill for the relief of Mary Wachter; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 902. A bill to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in a Quonset hut at Harrowbeer Airport, Yelverton, South Devon, England, on December 26, 1944; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WHEELER:

S. 903. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands in the State of Montana to John J. Akers; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

#### EXTENSION OF SELECTIVE TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT OF 1940—AMENDMENT

Mr. WALSH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 2625) to extend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

#### PUNISHMENT OF NAZI AND JAPANESE OFFICERS FOR CRIMES COMMITTED AGAINST AMERICAN ARMED FORCES

Mr. MYERS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 121), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:



Whereas ample proof exists that a large number of civilians and members of the armed forces of the United States, who are captives of Germany and Japan, are subject to deliberately barbarous and inhuman treatment at the hands of their captors, in open violation of the rules of warfare subscribed to and observed by civilized nations and peoples; and

Whereas in numerous cases disarmed and defenseless American prisoners have been murdered after their surrender; and

Whereas these atrocities have caused untold suffering on the part of the whole civilian population and particularly on the families of the victims; and

Whereas these crimes of officers and men of the German Army are in accordance with the teachings officially laid down in the basic German army manual for the instruction of officers in the army of Nazi Germany, the *Kriegsbrauch in Landkriege*, which is in contravention of the rules of the Hague Convention relating to the treatment of prisoners of war; and

Whereas the instructions laid down in the above-mentioned military manual are followed throughout the present war by both German and Japanese authorities; and

Whereas by their recorded acts of cruelty the members of the German Nazi and Japanese Governments and many known officers and men of the armies of both countries have placed themselves outside the pale of all laws, military or otherwise, and have forfeited all right to claim protection or immunity from punishment commensurate in severity with the magnitude of their crimes; and

Whereas repeated official declarations have emanated from the Governments of the United Nations that machinery will be set up and methods devised to mete out appropriate punishment to both German and Japanese war criminals, through whose acts soldiers and citizens of the United States and the members of their families have suffered; and

Whereas the Senate of the United States speaking for the citizens at large and especially for the victims of atrocities some of whom are killed and some of whom have been made to suffer needlessly, approves unreservedly of the preceding paragraph: Therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the Senate that all ranking officers of the Nazi and Japanese Governments as well as all officers and men who have been responsible for crimes against our soldiers, and for the suffering thereby inflicted upon the members of their families, be prosecuted as soon as they are apprehended; and that, if present military and international law does not adequately provide for punishment of persons responsible for such crimes, further efforts should be undertaken to modify such law to the extent necessary to provide for such punishment.

#### THE HOME GUARD—ADDRESS PREPARED BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the *Record* an address entitled "The Home Guard," prepared by Vice President Truman for delivery at the graduation exercises of the twenty-eighth session of the National Police Academy, Federal Bureau of Investigation, on April 14, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### TRIBUTE TO THE LATE PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT BY DEAN ALFANGE

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the *Record* a tribute to the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt delivered by Dean Alfange on April 17 at the memorial services of the Liberal Party at Manhattan Center, New York City, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING—ADDRESS BY EDWARD N. SCHEIBERLING, NATIONAL COMMANDER, AMERICAN LEGION

[Mr. GURNEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the *Record* an address on the subject of universal military training, delivered by Edward N. Scheiberling, national commander of the American Legion, at Washington, D. C., on April 18, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### TRIBUTE TO ERNIE PYLE

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the *Record* an editorial entitled "Ernie," from the Washington Daily News of April 19, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### ADDRESS BY FATHER FLANAGAN AT BANQUET IN TRIBUTE TO MR. HENRY MONSKY

[Mr. WHERRY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the *Record* an address in tribute to Mr. Henry Monsky, international president of B'nai B'rith, delivered by Father Flanagan, of Boys Town, Nebr., at a banquet at the Hotel Commodore, New York City, on February 26, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### REHABILITATION OF INDIA—ARTICLE BY WILLIAM D. PAWLEY

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the *Record* an article by Hon. William D. Pawley regarding India and its future from the Miami Daily News of February 11, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### PUBLICITY OF PROCEEDINGS AT THE SAN FRANCISCO CONFERENCE—EDITORIAL FROM THE FORT WAYNE SENTINEL

[Mr. CAPEHART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the *Record* an editorial entitled "Commendable Action," from the News-Sentinel of Fort Wayne, Ind., of April 4, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### BRETTON WOODS—ARTICLE BY EDWIN A. LAHEY

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the *Record* an article entitled "Bretton Woods," by Edwin A. Lahey, published in the Chicago Daily News of March 8, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### IMPORTANCE OF AIR POWER—EDITORIALS FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the *Record* editorials entitled "Preserving Our Air Power," "The Role of Air Power," and "Surplus Planes," published in the New York Times, which appear in the Appendix.]

#### TRIBUTE TO THE AMPHIBIOUS TRAINING COMMAND

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to the officers and men of the Amphibious Training Command, United States Atlantic Fleet, an organization which recently commemorated its third anniversary.

Amphibious. A word with a new meaning, so deeply imbedded within the hearts and minds of the world that it will live forever as one of the great phases of operation of World War No. 2.

In recent weeks we have all read with glowing pride the stories of Amphibious Training Command activities. For some months we have heard about the men, trained by this force, who have struck telling blows at the enemy on western as well as eastern beach heads.

I do not know how much my colleagues feel about the war successes brought about by amphibious operations. I do know of their interest in the war, but I have not any idea how much they have gone individually into the over-all picture.

But being interested in history, as well as the progress of the current conflict, I have inquired into the whys and wherefores of amphibious operations and have learned of some of the amazing things done by these men who storm enemy shores in their seemingly inexhaustible list of ships, vehicles, and equipment, known best by some alphabetical designation.

More important, or as equally so, I have learned that never before, anywhere in the world, has more farsightedness been displayed, or more remarkable advancements made in the development of new ideas and new plans, than those carried out in the special business of invasion.

It seems to me appropriate that we should pause, briefly though it may be, to recognize the full importance of such an organization, unknown, untried until 3 years ago.

The amphibious force, conceived prior to the outbreak of hostilities in the Pacific, was not actually created until March 16, 1942, at which time eight officers reported aboard a transport at NOB—naval operating base—in Norfolk, Va.

Rapid as was its growth, expansive and extensive as its problems, this amphibious organization flourished and eventually blossomed into what we all know has been a most remarkable and successful command.

Its recent observance of its third anniversary was occasion enough, was time, in fact, for America and the world to say, "Well done, Amphibious, well done."

It must therefore seem as amazing to my colleagues as it does to me, and to the millions who have watched the explosive power of these amphibians that such a huge job could possibly be done in such a short time.

In 3 years a force was formed, trained, and developed into a great fighting unit which overcame even insurmountable and impossible tasks, adopting as it were the slogan, "We can do the difficult immediately; the impossible takes a little longer."

But the Amphibious Training Command, located at Norfolk, Va., has not sought publicity or been marked by its social events and display. There was not time for all this, not with the job they had to do.

It is therefore a pleasure for me to pay tribute this day to the force commander, Rear Admiral Francis W. Rockwell; his chief of staff, Capt. William H. Hartt, Jr.; and to all of the 400,000 or more officers and men trained for the many duties of sailing a vast fleet of some 60,000 amphibious craft through some 40 invasions.

We here, long cognizant of the glorious work being done by our men and women in uniform in all branches of the service, can be proud that so many have done so much to make the Amphibious Training Command a vital part in this terrifying business of war.

For we know full well that without the amphibious force there could not and would not have been the proper training of men for invasions, and without invasions the progress, even the outcome, of the present conflict would have been questionable.

**SUGGESTION THAT HERBERT HOOVER BE A DELEGATE TO SAN FRANCISCO CONFERENCE**

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President as a freshman Senator, I have been content for the most part to sit and learn from my colleagues, many of whom have been in the service of the Nation for a long time.

By listening and observing, I have acquired much insight into legislative problems and increased my great respect for the Members of this body.

Although my legislative apprenticeship is by no means over, I hope my colleagues will permit me to make a suggestion which I believe is particularly timely.

From my observations of Congress in action it seems to me that its greatest service to the Nation lies in the fact that it is composed of men from all sections of the country and represents all aspects of American life.

I have confidence in our new leader. I have a deep faith in the sincerity of his purpose to build firmly upon the mutual desires and hopes of a united people. In order to give him the support he so richly deserves, we must avail ourselves of the best talents in our country.

Senate Republicans in conference sent to President Truman assurance of their cooperation for winning both the war and the peace. From every quarter of the country comes the same pledge.

I venture to say that it will be to the everlasting credit of our new President that he has graciously recognized the sincerity of those offers and intends to avail himself of them.

Mr. President, the need for experienced counsel appears on every hand. This was recognized by our late President when he chose from this body two prominent men who have contributed so much to American leadership in the field of foreign policy—the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] and the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

It is obvious from every sign in our national affairs that the United States has embarked on new courses in foreign policy. We are getting ready to assume new obligations in the world economy.

We are changing our historic attitudes toward and our relations with many foreign nations. We are proposing to assume new duties with regard to organizing, and perhaps enforcing, peace in the post-war world.

These are not ordinary times in the Nation's history. These things we are proposing to do are not routine functions that we may take lightly. On the contrary, they go to the heart of American interests. They do not affect our foreign affairs alone. We have so interlaced our foreign and domestic interests that the line between them is no longer distinct.

Not since the days of the founding of our country have we faced such momen-

tous decisions as now confront us. If the decisions made in foreign affairs are to stand the test of time, they must have the wholehearted support of our people.

In such circumstances, Mr. President, it is a dictate of the highest wisdom that we should seek counsel from the best-informed men and women in our public life. Wherever there is a man or woman whose talents, learning, experience, and achievements can shed a ray of light on the uncharted road ahead of us, that person should be called to the service of our country in this hour of great decisions.

My conviction on this point is so strong, and appears to me to be so right, that it overcomes the feeling of hesitation I would otherwise have in addressing the Senate as I am today. It encourages me to suggest the name of a man who I am certain can make a valuable contribution toward the solution of the problems that will arise in San Francisco.

He is a man whose knowledge, experience, and past achievements are outstanding—whose statesmanship has risen above all partisanship to the peak of unselfish devotion to his own country, and in the service of other countries of the world.

I refer, Mr. President, to a man we all know and respect, the Honorable Herbert Hoover.

Before the world knew Mr. Hoover as Chief Executive of the United States, it knew him as a man whose broad experience in international affairs was unparalleled in history.

The world early recognized him as an eminent mining engineer, who from 1895 to 1913 worked among the people on every continent. Mexico, Canada, Australia, Italy, Great Britain, South Africa, India, China, and Russia are only a few of the nations which must be grateful to him for his services as a technician.

Latin America will long remember his accomplishments in 1914, as head of the Panama Pacific Exposition.

President Wilson first honored Mr. Hoover in 1914 when he appointed him chairman of the American Relief Commission in London. A year later he was named chairman of the commission for relief in Belgium, and to this day the Belgians honor him for what he did in their behalf.

In 1917 he was appointed United States Food Administrator. For his success in this role he earned and received the commendation of the entire world.

But these were not all the responsibilities Herbert Hoover willingly assumed during World War No. 1.

He served with distinction as a member of the World Trade Commission. He was chairman of the following war agencies: The United States Grain Corporation, the United States Sugar Equalization Board, the Inter-Allied Food Council, the European Coal Council, and the Supreme Economic Council.

In 1919 he became chairman of the American Relief Administration and the following year he headed the European Relief Council.

In the trying years of post-war readjustment after 1921, Mr. Hoover served this country with distinction as Secretary of Commerce until, on March 4, 1929,

he was inaugurated President of the United States.

His great services during World War No. 1, the expansion of foreign trade under his guidance as Secretary of Commerce, and his work for world peace, mark him a man of insight and distinction.

He believes in international cooperation, based upon true friendship among nations, and upon sound economic relations between this country and all others.

To him, the right of sovereignty of any nation has never been dependent upon world power. Above all, he has never lost sight of the fact that to lead the world and to be of help to the world, the United States must be strong and must guard well its own legitimate interests.

What a disappointment it must be to a large portion of our people to know that this man who has contributed so much to world peace, who lives less than 30 miles from San Francisco, has not been invited to take some small part in this Conference.

Because of our strength, our sense of justice and fair play, and our unlimited reservoir of good will, the entire world is looking to the United States for leadership at this Conference.

Let us not fail mankind. Let us give the best we have. Let us mobilize the best talent our Nation has to offer.

I contend there is no substitute for experience—experienced minds, and experienced hearts.

I believe, Mr. President, we shall act wisely in this time of crisis if we add to the list of distinguished delegates already appointed the name of a great statesman, Herbert Hoover—the only living ex-President of the United States, whose intellectual honesty, unrivaled experience, world reputation and Christian heart surely entitle him to a place in the deliberations at San Francisco.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. As a former associate of President Hoover throughout World War No. 1 and in the subsequent world-wide relief operations which he directed, and as a friend of his for many years, I rise to express my appreciation of the fine tribute just paid him by the distinguished Senator from Indiana, and heartily to endorse the sentiments which the Senator has so eloquently expressed.

Mr. President, in this connection, I ask unanimous consent to incorporate as a part of my remarks the address on the San Francisco Conference and Peace, delivered by the Honorable Herbert Hoover before the Foreign Policy Association at Philadelphia last Tuesday night, April 17.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I know I express the sorrow of the American people that Mr. Roosevelt was not spared to guide the San Francisco Conference. The problems remain, and we must carry on. In this spirit, President Truman has announced that the Conference will proceed as planned. And it becomes our duty to give every support to President Truman in his gigantic task.



I was glad to accept your invitation to speak to your association. Philadelphia has always been devoted to peace. It was founded by a faith of which I am a member; this city is, indeed, the place where my ancestors landed on American soil.

Tonight I propose to explore Dumbarton Oaks proposals in the light of experience, particularly of the League of Nations. Indeed, the time has come to appraise frankly the forces we must meet; to explore them with the lamp of experience. The time has gone by for emotional generalizations, and this is no time to engage in destructive debate.

Three years ago Hugh Gibson and I published a study of world experience in making peace. We made some suggestions of principles from this experience that should be incorporated in any organization to preserve peace. Some of this experience was adopted, some important lessons were either wholly omitted or only weakly accepted in the Dumbarton Oaks proposals. President Roosevelt and Secretary Stettinius have stated that plan is open to amendment.

Three weeks ago I published some suggestions directed to strengthening the Dumbarton Oaks proposals.

It was a great satisfaction that 10 days later most of these suggestions were also put forward by the representatives of the peace committees of the three great religious groups, the Protestants, the Catholics, and the Jews.

On the same day, Moscow took me to task for these proposals. They obviously did not have my full statement. Anyway, Moscow's argument reminds me of an old Quaker friend who said, "If thee do not repent in a measure and change thy ways considerably, thee will be damned to a certain extent."

#### THE PRESENT SITUATION

But before I discuss these suggestions I should like to make an observation on the present setting of peace.

With the discovery of new methods of killing; with the shift from wars between men to war against women and children; and with the gigantic destruction of centuries of men's toil, a third world war will mean the extinction of civilization.

When we in America took up the sword, it was inevitable from the hates, revenge, and violence which would follow this war that we must hold the sword either alone or jointly with others if we would maintain peace.

If the charter at San Francisco emerges with a reasonable hope of success, the United States must take its full part in carrying it out.

As a consequence of this war, Russia has again—and I hope forever—demonstrated by her gallant armies and by her alliance with General Winter and General Space, that she is impregnable. America by her gallant sons and our alliance with General Ocean and General Invention occupies a similar position. Britain's indomitable people allied with General Endurance and General Diplomacy have shown that they can preserve their Empire. But the survival of western civilization in the United States and in the world depends upon unity in certain principles common to Britain, France, and the other democracies.

It is my hope that no cleavage shall develop between western civilization and the rest of the world which will involve another world war. Truly the world should be too exhausted to suffer a third world war for another 20 years. In the meantime, it is my belief that with collaboration between the great centers of power in Washington, London, Paris, Moscow, and Chungking that peace can be preserved, and the processes of peace can be developed in an atmosphere of good will and understanding.

But we must build and build the methods to preserve peace.

#### TO PRESERVE PEACE

There are three general methods by which peace can be preserved:

First. Through pacific methods, to settle controversies between nations by negotiation, arbitration, and judicial decisions. This is the rule of law and justice.

Second. If these measures fail, then the use of force to stop aggression. This is the police power to enforce justice.

Third. Beyond these methods there can be no lasting peace unless we summon the moral, spiritual forces which will diminish or stop the underlying dynamic cause of wars.

#### DUMBARTON OAKS

The League of Nations, as you know, was set up with an assembly of all nations and a Council partly of permanent members comprising certain great powers and partly of members elected by the assembly. The League provided for pacific means of settling controversies and for a World Court. It proposed to use economic and military force against an aggressor. The Dumbarton Oaks plan is patterned closely upon the League with somewhat less authority in the assembly and more in the Council. In the original Dumbarton Oaks proposals the machinery of force to stop an aggressor was made much more powerful than in the League. Force was made its major instrument to preserve peace. At the instant summons of the Security Council, economic boycott, the armies, navies, and air forces of the world were to stop an aggressor in his tracks. But a compromise as to voting rights of the permanent members of the Dumbarton Oaks Security Council was agreed upon as the result of Russian protest. By that compromise the great nations who were members of the Security Council have a veto power to prevent any designation of their own actions as aggression. Practically, that puts all the great military powers out of reach. And world wars are not started by small nations.

The power of the Security Council was thus devitalized to practically the same level of effectiveness as the Council of the old League of Nations. We saw the practical destruction of the League when it failed to stop aggression of two of its own permanent Council members. That was, Italy's invasion of Ethiopia and Japan's invasion of China. (Please do not confuse these voting powers with those in the assembly which I am not discussing.)

This retreat in the potency of force seemed to me to make it imperative to develop at San Francisco the pacific methods of maintaining peace, together with a mobilization of the forces which would ally or control the underlying causes of war.

#### AMENDMENTS AND ADDITIONS TO THE DUMBARTON OAKS PROPOSALS

The proposals which I made 3 weeks ago to this end were seven in number to which I will add two more. They are:

First. There are certain fundamental political rights of men and of nations that should be specified in the charter. There are certain moral and spiritual standards of conduct among nations that should be proclaimed. I proposed we should make them effective by the establishment of a world committee to promote these political rights. This committee should rank with the economic and social committees already contained in the Dumbarton Oaks plan.

Second. We should provide for peaceful revision of onerous treaties between nations at, say, 10-year intervals, in order that political progress in the world should not be frozen with its dangers of violent outbreaks.

Third. We should create regional subdivisions of the organization for preservation of peace into three areas—Asia, Europe, and the Western Hemisphere; the regional organiza-

tions must, of course, be in harmony with the Security Council.

Fourth. We should insist upon total disarmament of the enemy powers.

Fifth. We should provide prompt proportional post-war reduction in the armies of the United Nations and the establishment of a maximum limit of armies, navies, and air power among them.

Sixth. Although it is not a part of the charter itself, I suggested a method by which the war powers of the Congress could be preserved without delay to action in a crisis.

Seventh. Take enough time in formulating the charter of peace to do it right.

And tonight I add two more suggestions. There should be a control of military alliances. There should be a definition of aggression. And Senator VANDENBERG's proposal that the assembly be given freedom of initiative should be adopted.

The purpose of these additions is: First, to surround the mechanistic bones of the charter with moral and spiritual forces. Second, to create those standards of conduct which should be the base of decision by the Security Council. Third, to reach into the causes of war much more deeply than just the settling of quarrels and the curbing of gangsters. And fourth, to simplify the work of the organization.

Mankind has made gigantic progress in methods to destroy civilization by improving upon his previous inventions. Likewise, in our efforts to save civilization from war we must not neglect our previous inventions and organizations of peace both for their successes and the causes of their failure.

The Holy Alliance of 125 years ago and its enforcement agency, the Quadruple Alliance, were set up on the theory that the peace of Vienna should be frozen fast by military power. The League of Nations was set up on a more enlightened basis—that if controversies arose between nations they should be settled by pacific means before force was used.

The League of Nations was the greatest experiment in history. It succeeded in settling many secondary quarrels, but it suffered from several grave weaknesses and many handicaps. My suggestions are directed to remedy these weaknesses and handicaps. That experience furnishes impressive reasons for the proposals I have made.

#### ALLAYING THE CAUSES OF WAR

The primary weakness of the Holy Alliance, the League of Nations, and Dumbarton Oaks proposals is the failure to face the facts as to the real causes of war.

These gigantic explosions of modern civilization into world wars arise from more powerful forces than incidental quarrels. Quarrels are always the symptoms and not the disease. These forces which cause war are too easily obscured by over simplification. They are not wholly the work of evil men or perverted nations to be reformed even by a periodic spanking of aggressors. For purposes of discussion we can group these underlying dynamic forces as:

First. Attempts at domination of other races and the counterstrivings of nations for freedom. That is, modern imperialism.

Second. Its handmaiden, militarism, with its train of armies and military alliances.

Third. Economic pressures.

Fourth. Crusades for faiths, including economic faiths. That is, militant ideologies.

Fifth. The impulses to change which are inherent in the progress of civilization.

Sixth. The complexes of fear, hate, and revenge.

As I have said, we cannot make a lasting peace unless these forces be so channeled that they cease to drive the world into wars. That was the major cause of failure at Versailles.

The Versailles Treaty consisted of 623 paragraphs, of which 26 were devoted to the creation of the League of Nations. The origins of the present war lay largely in the 597 paragraphs defining the set-up of nations, their boundaries, the reparations, the military and economic questions. Imperialism, militarism, economic pressures, hate, and vengeance sat at that peace table. Many of the underlying causes of war were perpetuated and some of them were stimulated to more violence.

Because of the weaknesses and handicaps of the League it was not strong enough in after years to cope with the situation created by the war settlements. Some superficial thinkers assert the League failed because the American people refused to join. That would not have saved the Treaty of Versailles.

Men at Versailles realized the weakness of the League, but they said we should avoid difficult questions in the Covenant. They said what we needed to do was to get some sort of League going and it would solve these questions. It never did. The same kind of voices are being raised today decrying any attempt to improve the San Francisco agreement.

Now we are fighting the Second World War because of these sins of omission and commission in the Treaty of Versailles and the League's inability to preserve peace.

#### ESTABLISHING THE RIGHTS OF NATIONS AND MEN AGAINST DOMINATION

Twenty-eight years ago President Wilson among his points sought to infuse a moral and spiritual element in the peace. He sought to establish the political rights of nations and of men. He sought to formulate standards of conduct and law among nations. He sought to curb and allay the causes of war. These ideas received scant support at Versailles.

When this Second World War came 20 years later, we were told repeatedly and eloquently that after the defeat of the enemy the great purpose of the war was to establish the political rights of nations and men. Those rights as proclaimed by Mr. Wilson's points were again reaffirmed in the Atlantic Charter. Twenty-six countries signed it including Russia. These principles and others were affirmed in the Moscow and in the Yalta declarations and in a hundred speeches of our leaders in war.

These statements specifically include the right of peoples to equal sovereignty, freedom from aggression and domination by others, and the right of nations to determine their own government without interference. They particularize that there shall be no aggrandizement, no annexations, and no territorial changes without the freely expressed wishes of the peoples; that nations have the right to determine their wishes by unfettered elections, by free secret ballot and under international control if necessary. They assert the right of freedom of the seas in peacetimes and equality of trade. They also proclaimed disarmament; that nations should never use war as an instrument of national policy; and that peace must be based upon justice.

Beyond these rights and standards of conduct of nations there are the rights and protections of human beings. These have been eloquently and repeatedly stated by our leaders in this war. Their establishment is proclaimed to be also one of the purposes of the war. Their all-inclusive term is freedom of men. They at least include protection of persons from execution or imprisonment without fair trial; prohibitions against compulsory labor or slavery in any disguise; protections to minorities and backward peoples; the freedom of speech, of the press and of religion.

Nor are these rights of men strange ideas. The essence of them appears in American,

British, and also the Soviet Russian Constitutions.

When we come again after 25 years to San Francisco to write the charter of peace, why do we not remedy the failure of a quarter of a century ago? There is nowhere else in this treaty making that we record the moral, spiritual and lawful standards of conduct among nations and men.

Nor should this be done by timid references to the Atlantic Charter with all its qualifying words of "hopes" and "desires." If these principles are right, they should be boldly stated.

Vital experience in all this matter is to be derived from our American experiment in government. There was genius in the mechanism of the American Constitution. But its transcendent genius was its great moral and spiritual base in the Bill of Rights. This Government would never have endured had it been a mechanism alone.

And if these rights are to be effective, they cannot be left alone to perform themselves. There should be a world committee in the new organization whose job is to look after them.

By the magnificent valor of the armies and navies we have won the battle of the Atlantic, the battle of the Pacific, the battle of the Philippines. We are near to victory in the battle of Germany and the battle of Japan. But are we winning the battle of freedom?

Americans must face brutal facts. As the result of this war the area of human freedom will shrink by whole nations. It is shrinking in many nations. Are we going to dodge these issues at San Francisco?

#### EASING STRAINS BY PEACEFUL CHANGE

Three years ago I stated that one great weakness of the League was that it made no adequate provision to ease strains by orderly change in agreements between nations when they became onerous or inapplicable. Inasmuch as violation of peace treaties became aggression, the League became the defender and the guarantor of the status quo. In fact the intention of some of its founders was just that. Its failure to ease pressures contributed to World War No. 2.

Once we settle down to peace again there will be treaties defining boundaries and other relations or imposed relations of nations. The aggressor will again be anyone who violates the then existing situation. Thus the world organization and thus the American people automatically become the guarantor of a new status quo. And as the war settlements have not yet been made we are in the dark as to what we are about to guarantee.

Abundant experience after the last war demonstrated that dangerous pressures are sure to arise. There will be provisions imposed during the heat of war emotions. There will be the shift in economic pressures and populations. There will be the growth of ideas and inventions. There will be the development of backward nations which become conscious and capable of self government.

And let no man think that there will not be unpredictable forces and pressures in the world after this war. If we can scan former convulsions of the modern western world we see that, following these long periods of general war and disorder, new shapes of civilization and new forms of nations have emerged. Civilization has taken new impulses and new directions. We must expect new forms and new directions from this gigantic explosion. No one can pretend to see these shapes clearly. But we must not attempt to freeze the world again, or it will explode again.

If peaceful means are denied, war becomes the only available solvent.

#### REGIONAL ORGANIZATION TO RELIEVE STRAINS

Another weakness of the League was that its Council was overburdened with all the minor troubles and confused voices of the world at every session.

To relieve these strains there should be a definite regional set-up into the three great separate areas of the world—Europe, Asia, and the Americas. The Asian Council could by virtue of its interests include not only the Asiatic nations but also Britain, Russia, France, and the United States.

The regions could each settle most of their problems far better than it can be done by more distant nations. This confusion of voices led Secretaries of State to bypass the League. And Secretaries of State should be the representatives in person on these regional councils within their own areas. It would lend dignity to the organization. It would thus cure another of the League's weaknesses of sending a boy to do a responsible man's job.

Each region should have the first responsibility to keep the peace and devise policies for peace. Any use of force should be reserved to the Security Council. It would thus be free to deal only with questions that contain dangers of world war. This method would also give the smaller nations the larger voice they need. It would relieve America and other nations from the strains of many a minor foreign dispute. This would seem to be practical for Mr. Churchill has endorsed it. The Department of State has already taken a long step in this direction at the Mexico City Conference.

#### STOPPING MILITARISM

Another lesson we learned from the weakness of the League was the lame provision for reduction of arms and the lack of control of military alliances. Herein are the sleepless bacilli of militarism.

I proposed that at San Francisco we should stiffen the whole attack upon these causes of war; that we agree to total disarmament of Germany and Japan with no manufacture of weapons for a whole generation or until they have forgotten the know-how of war. And equally important, that the United Nations should set up a program to reduce progressively and proportionately their own arms and do it quickly after the war.

There should also be some control of military alliances by the Security Council. The multitude of these alliances after the last war inspired fear, counter alliances, increase of armament. They made for balances of power, and they created voting blocs in the League. They not only weakened the League but they contributed to World War No. 2.

#### DEFINING AGGRESSION

Aggression in this world is not confined to the old-fashioned threats or to military action or even to economic pressures. Our experience with the Nazis who infiltrated their poisonous propaganda and fifth columns into the lands of peaceful neighbors should indicate that there is a new form of aggression in the world.

Therefore, the San Francisco Charter should agree upon a definition of aggression to include direct or indirect subsidized governmental propaganda in other nations. The enforcement of such a provision would help cure that cause of wars which grows out of crusading faith, political or otherwise.

#### WE SHOULD NOT BE STAMPEDED INTO BLUNDERS

We cannot hope for perfection. In any event the Dumbarton Oaks press release does not purport to be the form of a treaty. It is a statement of principles. It must be drafted into precise terms. It is the height of wisdom that the people of the world should have a chance to see its final wording and to have a period in which to consider and even



improve the agreement before it is signed. It will be more certain to last.

We do not have to hurry. If we take 6 years to make war it might be a good idea to take a few more months to build a sound organization to keep the peace. It was 7 years from Yorktown to the Constitution.

#### THE WAR SETTLEMENTS

Beyond the San Francisco charter one-half of the making of peace will lay in the political, economic, and territorial settlements of the war. If we do them well, peace will largely preserve itself. If we do them badly, no organization to maintain peace can succeed. I shall discuss these questions on some other occasion, but here I may say that we must not again sow dragons' teeth. And appeasement is a dragon's tooth.

#### IN CONCLUSION

Truly peace is a matter of spirit; it rests upon moral forces, upon the building of good will among mankind.

The Sermon on the Mount launched that transcendent concept of good will among men as the basis of peace. And despite all his violations man has received from that divine message an undying inspiration to strive for peace. Those spiritual concepts of peace have at least brought it to pass that every war must be professed by its leaders as a war of defense and for the purpose of securing peace. They have brought into the world the concept that aggression is an infamy. And that domination over unwilling people is immoral.

The great purpose of America in this war is lasting peace. That is all that we can possibly get from this dreadful sacrifice of life and the awful burdens upon our children. If the world will cooperate to give our children this boon, their tears will not be less but their labor over years to come will be brightened with confidence and the future lighted with hope.

We must not fall now.

#### THE PACT OF PARIS

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, in view of the fact that we are almost at dawn of a great Conference in San Francisco at which the United Nations will try to arrive at some formula by which to outlaw war, it strikes me as particularly appropriate at this moment to call the attention of the Senate to the Pact of Paris. The Pact of Paris was adopted by many of the nations on August 27, 1928. I find the following signatories to that treaty, a solemn treaty of the nations to try to outlaw war: Germany, the United States of America, Great Britain, France, Belgium, Australia, Canada, New Zealand, South Africa, the Irish Free State, India, Italy, Poland and Czechoslovakia.

For the benefit of the Senate I want to refer to two or three paragraphs of that treaty. The opening paragraphs of the treaty are as follows:

Deeply sensible of their solemn duty to promote the welfare of mankind;

Persuaded that the time has come when a frank renunciation of war as an instrument of national policy should be made to the end that the peaceful and friendly relations now existing between their peoples may be perpetuated;

Convinced that all changes in their relations with one another should be sought only by peaceful means and be the result of a peaceful and orderly process, and that any signatory Power which shall hereafter seek to promote its national interests by resort to war should be denied the benefits furnished by this treaty.

The first two paragraphs of the treaty itself are as follows:

ARTICLE I. The high contracting parties solemnly declare in the names of their respective peoples that they condemn recourse to war for the solution of international controversies, and renounce it as an instrument of national policy in their relations with one another.

ART. II. The high contracting parties agree that the settlement or solution of all disputes or conflicts of whatever nature or of whatever origin they may be, which may arise among them, shall never be sought except by pacific means.

Mr. President, the Pact of Paris was also signed, within a few months after its original signing, by a great many other countries. Among the other countries were the Republics of Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania. I have inquired of the Library of Congress as to the present status of this treaty, solemnly entered into by the various nations which signed it. I am told that the treaty is in full force and effect, and has never been renounced by any nation. I call attention again to the fact that the Republic of Poland was one of the original signatories of that solemn treaty. The little republics of Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania, which I have mentioned, were also signatories within a few months of the original signing.

Delegates have been appointed by our President to attend the San Francisco Conference. I feel that they should call the attention of that conference to the existing treaty, which is in force today, and has been since 1928. I should like to know what steps, if any, the State Department of the United States has taken to bring the matters set forth in the Pact of Paris to the attention of the conference at San Francisco, or what the Department intends to do about it.

We all recognize the fact that it is proposed to dismember the Republic of Poland. Newspaper reports are the only source of information which I have. They are to the effect that the United States Government and the Government of Great Britain have acceded to the proposal for the dismemberment of the Republic of Poland. Russia has completely swallowed the little Republics of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia. It has destroyed their existence in the world of nations.

I should like to know from the State Department, for the benefit of our delegates to San Francisco, what steps, if any, we are taking to call this treaty to the attention of that conference. Why have not the little republics which I have just mentioned, as well as the great Republic of Poland, been invited by the United Nations to be represented at the conference at San Francisco? If justice is to be one of the cardinal points of the Dumbarton Oaks proposal—and I fully agree that it should be—surely these little nations should be given an opportunity to be represented and take part in that conference. With the provisions of the Pact of Paris still in full force and effect, we should consider that pact in connection with our proposals, desires, and hopes to outlaw war again, in view of

what has happened since 1928, when this pact was signed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the Pact of Paris printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks. It is found in volume 1, Foreign Relations of the United States for 1928, beginning on page 153.

There being no objection, the Pact of Paris was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TREATY BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND OTHER POWERS, SIGNED AT PARIS, AUGUST 27, 1928

The President of the German Reich, the President of the United States of America, His Majesty the King of Belgium, the President of the French Republic, His Majesty the King of Great Britain, Ireland, and the British Dominions Beyond the Seas, Emperor of India, His Majesty the King of Italy, His Majesty the Emperor of Japan, the President of the Republic of Poland, the President of the Czechoslovak Republic.

Deeply sensible of their solemn duty to promote the welfare of mankind;

Persuaded that the time has come when a frank renunciation of war as an instrument of national policy should be made to the end that the peaceful and friendly relations now existing between their peoples may be perpetuated;

Convinced that all changes in their relations with one another should be sought only by peaceful means and be the result of a peaceful and orderly process, and that any signatory Power which shall hereafter seek to promote its national interests by resort to war should be denied the benefits furnished by this Treaty;

Hopeful that, encouraged by their example, all the other nations of the world will join in this humane endeavor and by adhering to the present Treaty as soon as it comes into force bring their peoples within the scope of its beneficent provisions, thus uniting the civilized nations of the world in a common renunciation of war as an instrument of their national policy;

Have decided to conclude a Treaty and for that purpose have appointed as their respective Plenipotentiaries:

The President of the German Reich: Dr. Gustav Stresemann, Minister for Foreign Affairs;

The President of the United States of America: The Honorable Frank B. Kellogg, Secretary of State;

His Majesty the King of the Belgians: Mr. Paul Hymans, Minister for Foreign Affairs, Minister of State;

The President of the French Republic: Mr. Aristide Briand, Minister for Foreign Affairs;

His Majesty the King of Great Britain, Ireland, and the British Dominions Beyond the Seas, Emperor of India: For Great Britain and Northern Ireland and all parts of the British Empire which are not separate Members of the League of Nations: The Right Honourable Lord Cushendun, Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, Acting Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs; For the Dominion of Canada: The Right Honourable William Lyon Mackenzie King, Prime Minister and Minister for External Affairs; For the Commonwealth of Australia: The Honourable Alexander John McLachlan, Member of the Executive Federal Council; For the Dominion of New Zealand: The Honourable Sir Christopher James Parr, High Commissioner for New Zealand in Great Britain; For the Union of South Africa: The Honourable Jacobus Stephanus Smit, High Commissioner for the Union of South Africa in Great Britain; For the Irish Free State: Mr. William Thomas Cosgrave, President of the Executive Council; For India: The Right Honourable Lord Cushendun, Chancellor of

the Duchy of Lancaster, Acting Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs;

His Majesty the King of Italy: Count Gaetano Manzoni, his Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary at Paris;

His Majesty the Emperor of Japan: Count Uchida, Privy Councillor;

The President of the Republic of Poland: Mr. A. Zaleski, Minister for Foreign Affairs;

The President of the Czechoslovak Republic: Dr. Eduard Benes, Minister for Foreign Affairs;

who, having communicated to one another their full powers found in good and due form have agreed upon the following articles:

#### ARTICLE I

The High Contracting Parties solemnly declare in the names of their respective peoples that they condemn recourse to war for the solution of international controversies, and renounce it as an instrument of national policy in their relations with one another.

#### ARTICLE II

The High Contracting Parties agree that the settlement or solution of all disputes or conflicts of whatever nature or of whatever origin they may be, which may arise among them, shall never be sought except by pacific means.

#### ARTICLE III

The present Treaty shall be ratified by the High Contracting Parties named in the Preamble in accordance with their respective constitutional requirements, and shall take effect as between them as soon as all their several instruments of ratification shall have been deposited at Washington.

This Treaty shall, when it has come into effect as prescribed in the preceding paragraph, remain open as long as may be necessary for adherence by all the other Powers of the world. Every instrument evidencing the adherence of a Power shall be deposited at Washington and the Treaty shall immediately upon such deposit become effective as between the Power thus adhering and the other Powers parties hereto.

It shall be the duty of the Government of the United States to furnish each Government named in the Preamble and every Government subsequently adhering to this Treaty with a certified copy of the Treaty and of every instrument of ratification or adherence. It shall also be the duty of the Government of the United States telegraphically to notify such Governments immediately upon the deposit with it of each instrument of ratification or adherence.

In faith whereof the respective Plenipotentiaries have signed this Treaty in the French and English languages both texts having equal force, and hereunto affix their seals.

Done at Paris, the twenty-seventh day of August in the year one thousand nine hundred and twenty-eight.

[SEAL] GUSTAV STRESEMANN  
[SEAL] FRANK B. KELLOGG  
[SEAL] PAUL HYMANS  
[SEAL] ARL BRIAND  
[SEAL] CUSHENDUN  
[SEAL] W. L. MACKENZIE KING  
[SEAL] A. J. MCLACHLAN  
[SEAL] C. J. PARR  
[SEAL] J. S. SMIT  
[SEAL] LIAM T. MACCOSAIG  
[SEAL] CUSHENDUN  
[SEAL] G. MANZONI  
[SEAL] UCHIDA  
[SEAL] AUGUST ZALESKI  
[SEAL] DR. EDUARD BENES

The treaty also went into effect on July 24, 1929, for the following states whose duly ratified instruments of adherence had already been deposited at the Department of State:

Afghanistan (November 30, 1928).  
Albania (February 12, 1929).

Austria (December 31, 1928).  
Bulgaria (July 22, 1929).  
China (May 8, 1929).  
Cuba (March 13, 1929).  
Denmark (March 23, 1929).  
Dominican Republic (December 12, 1928).  
Egypt (May 9, 1929).  
Estonia (April 26, 1929).  
Ethiopia (November 28, 1928).  
Finland (July 24, 1929).  
Guatemala (July 16, 1929).  
Hungary (July 22, 1929).  
Iceland (June 10, 1929).  
Latvia (July 23, 1929).  
Liberia (February 23, 1929).  
Lithuania (April 5, 1929).  
Netherlands (July 12, 1929).  
Nicaragua (May 13, 1929).  
Norway (March 26, 1929).  
Panama (February 25, 1929).  
Peru (July 23, 1929).  
Portugal (March 1, 1929).  
Rumania (March 21, 1929).  
Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes, Kingdom of the (February 20, 1929).  
Siam (January 16, 1929).  
Spain (March 7, 1929).  
Sweden (April 12, 1929).  
Turkey (July 8, 1929).  
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (September 27, 1928).

The treaty went into effect for the following states upon date of deposit at the Department of State of duly ratified instruments of adherence:

Brazil (May 10, 1934).  
Chile (August 12, 1929).  
Colombia (May 28, 1931).  
Costa Rica (October 1, 1929).  
Danzig, Free City of (September 11, 1929) (transmitted by the Polish Government on behalf of Danzig).  
Ecuador (February 24, 1932).  
Greece (August 3, 1929).  
Haiti (March 10, 1930).  
Hedjaz and Nejd, Kingdom of the (February 24, 1932) (invitation to adhere issued after recognition of the Hejazi Government in 1931).  
Honduras (August 5, 1929).  
Iraq (March 23, 1932) (invitation to adhere issued after recognition of the Iraqi Government in 1931).  
Luxemburg (August 24, 1929).  
Mexico (November 26, 1929).  
Paraguay (December 4, 1929).  
Persia (July 25, 1929).  
Switzerland (December 2, 1929).  
Venezuela (October 24, 1929).  
Instruments of adherence were not deposited by the following States: Argentina, Bolivia, El Salvador, and Uruguay.

#### LAWRENCE M. LAWSON

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, during the time of the discussion of the water treaty with Mexico several severe attacks were made against Mr. L. M. Lawson as to his residence, and so forth, and so on. I did not do it during the debate on the treaty, but now I ask to have printed in the RECORD a brief memorandum respecting Mr. Lawson, his origin, his service, and his qualifications, and so on, so as to absolve him from any unjust charges.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the memorandum will be printed in the RECORD.

The memorandum is as follows:

Lawrence M. Lawson is the son of a United States cavalry officer, Col. Gaines Lawson, who distinguished himself in the Southwest, and a descendant of Amos Lawrence, founder of the Kansas settlement of that name.

Mr. Lawson has ably continued the pioneer tradition of his family through a lifetime spent in the development of the frontier

region of the Southwest, notably in the lower Colorado River Basin and in the upper Rio Grand Basin.

He was born in 1879 at Washington, D. C., and received his preparatory and academic education in California institutions, having attended the Throop Polytechnic Institute at Pasadena, Calif.; the Mount Tamalpais Military Academy at San Rafael, Calif.; and Leland Stanford University at Palo Alto, Calif.

He was assistant engineer on the San Francisco water supply studies in 1901, and was a hydrographic aide, United States Geological Survey, in 1902. In 1902 he made the topographic survey of the Davis Dam site (Bullshead Reservoir) on the Colorado River. He was appointed under the civil service as an employee of the Department of the Interior in 1903. During 1903 and 1904 he was topographer in charge of surveys on the Colorado in Nevada, California, and Arizona for the then Reclamation Service.

From 1905 to 1911, inclusive, he served the Reclamation Service in various capacities on the Yuma project on the lower Colorado River adjacent to the international boundary. This was one of the first projects constructed under the supervision of the Reclamation Service. During that time he was assistant engineer on the project in 1905; resident engineer on levee construction in 1906; assistant engineer on the Yuma project, 1907 to 1911; and assistant to the supervising engineer, southern district, of the Reclamation Service in 1912, supervising engineering of the southern district with headquarters at Los Angeles, Calif., and was in charge of operation and maintenance of the Yuma and Salt River Valley projects in Arizona, the Orland project in California, and the Rio Grande and Carlsbad projects in New Mexico.

The first assignment on the Rio Grande was made in 1912 when he was appointed project engineer in charge of the Elephant Butte project, New Mexico and Texas. However, his personal knowledge of the Colorado River was again needed, and in 1915 he was recalled to the Yuma project where as project engineer he was placed in charge of works which involved an average annual expenditure of \$600,000. He was transferred to the Elephant Butte project where he served as project engineer from 1917 to 1926. During this time he was in charge of an extensive program of irrigation and drainage works embracing an annual expenditure of approximately \$1,000,000. During his 10-year service as project engineer he was also an assistant in the solution of many flood-control problems encountered along the 200 miles of the Rio Grande from Elephant Butte Reservoir to Fort Quitman, Tex.

In 1927 Mr. Lawson was transferred to the Department of State as Commissioner of the United States on the International Boundary Commission, United States and Mexico. He was the first engineer to fill this position since the resignation of Commissioner Anson Mills in 1914.

He was appointed as Commissioner by President Coolidge. In 1930 he was appointed International Water Commissioner by President Hoover.

Jurisdiction of the Commission, of which he is the United States representative, embraces all questions pertaining to the location of the land and water boundary between the United States as established and modified by the various treaties.

Mr. Lawson's record as United States Commissioner is outstanding. He has had charge of and directed the design and construction of water-control and flood-control projects along the border under agreements negotiated with Mexico. He has also negotiated a settlement of the national sovereignty of large numbers of tracts of land known as *bancos*, which had been cut from each country.



NOTE BY C. V. S.—A summary of all bancos eliminated is on file at the Department as it was sent Dr. Timm the latter part of 1944. Includes total acreage as well as location by rivers.)

Mr. Lawson and the Mexican Commissioner drafted the preliminary plans for the straightening of the Rio Grande in the El Paso-Juarez Valley to provide boundary stabilization and flood-control projects. A convention between the United States and Mexico resulted in the adoption of the plans for the rectification of the Rio Grande above Fort Quitman. The reach below El Paso was shortened from 155 miles to 88 miles and tracts of land comprising 5,000 acres contained in the river bends were exchanged for an equal acreage similarly cut from Mexican territory.

Mr. Lawson's early professional life was devoted to the solution of problems in the Colorado River Basin, largely in its lower reaches. He is one of the Nation's best informed engineers on the Colorado River problems. This was recognized during meetings of the Committee of Sixteen of the Seven Colorado River Basin States when at one time, during an executive session of the committee, an impassioned plea was made that the committee request the State Department to place the negotiation of the proposed Mexican water treaty in the hands of Mr. Lawson, since, as was said, Mr. Lawson was well informed concerning problems of the Southwest and problems of the Colorado River, and was a resident of the Southwest. This plea was made at a time when it appeared to the Committee of Sixteen that the allotment of water to be negotiated by the State Department, as such, in Washington, and that Mr. Lawson would be called in only on the working out of the details of the treaty after the allotment had been agreed to by the State Department of the United States and the Department of Foreign Relations of Mexico.

Mr. Lawson is an honorary member of the American Society of Civil Engineers and of the American Association of Engineers. Only engineers of the highest standing in the profession are eligible for nomination as honorary members of civil engineers. The number of such members is limited to 40 out of a total membership in the American society of 20,000. The requirements for consideration as to eligibility for honorary membership in the society are as follows:

"3. Honorary members shall be chosen only from persons of acknowledged eminence in some branch of engineering or the sciences related thereto. There shall not be at any one time more than 1 honorary member for every 300 corporate members. Not more than 5 honorary members shall be elected in any one year."

At the present time of the membership of about 20,000 of the American Society of Civil Engineers, less than 40 are honorary members. Among the honorary members other than Mr. Lawson, may be mentioned Gen. Brehon Somervell, Rear Admiral Ben Moreell, John Lucian Savage, and Herbert Hoover.

#### NEED FOR HEBREW DELEGATES AT SAN FRANCISCO CONFERENCE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, today I issued a statement on the need for delegates to the San Francisco Conference to represent the Hebrew Nation. I ask unanimous consent to have that statement printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks, together with a letter on the same subject to the Secretary of State, from Peter H. Bergson, chairman of the Hebrew Committee of National Liberation.

There being no objection, the statement and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I rise to speak today on a question that has the sympathy of all Members of this body. But I say that the time is long past for mere sympathy. It is in our power to see justice done; and I stand here today, Mr. President, and ask that we of America lead the way and do so. I am referring to the fact, Mr. President, that no Hebrew delegates have been invited to sit at the United Nations conference in San Francisco.

When I speak of Hebrews, I wish to stress that I do not refer to the thousands of citizens of our Allied Nations who adhere to the Jewish religion, for they are represented by the members of their own governments. The people I refer to are the some 2,000,000 so-called stateless Jews and ex-enemy nationals today in Europe, and the 700,000 Hebrew nationals who reside in Palestine.

My heart is very heavy, Mr. President, when I view the past record of extermination and persecution that the Hebrew people of Europe have undergone and when I see, on the other hand, the pitiful statements of sympathy we have given in turn and the lack of acknowledgment on our part of their existence in this war as one of our allies. Surely their underground fighters deserve the same recognition as Egypt's neutrality during our darkest period of the war. Surely their 4,000,000 casualties deserve the same recognition as Ibn Saud's royal, passive onlookers in this war.

But aside from all logic, I say, Mr. President, that a democratic peace cannot endure with omissions and reservations. I say, Mr. President, that it is not a good augury for world peace that among all the peoples of the world the Hebrews of Palestine and their brethren in Europe alone will be excluded from representing their cause before the council of the United Nations.

I say, Mr. President, that no people, from the last-minute bandwagon belligerents right down to England itself, has suffered such casualties and dislocations as the Hebrews. None needs more desperately to have its representatives sit at the deliberations. No nation has so old or so sore a problem to resolve as has the Hebrew people.

Mr. President, the Hebrew Committee of National Liberation is a body of Hebrews in this country who are working valiantly to see that their people are given justice and a chance to survive. This committee will be in San Francisco unofficially trying to represent the interests of their martyred people at this momentous conference of the United Nations. I wish to make a special plea to our American representatives that they heed the voice of this people at the conference and that they make certain that the hand of justice is not outweighed by too much consideration for oil and headresses.

HEBREW COMMITTEE OF  
NATIONAL LIBERATION,  
Washington, D. C., April 2, 1945.  
The Honorable EDWARD R. STETTINIUS, Jr.,  
Secretary of State,  
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: On behalf of the Hebrew Committee of National Liberation, I hereby present for the consideration of the Government of the United States the request of the Hebrew Committee of National Liberation that it be invited to constitute a delegation representing the viewpoint and interests of the Hebrew nation at the forthcoming United Nations Security Conference in San Francisco.

May I at the same time point out that this request differs fundamentally from the many appeals that have been made for representation of the Jewish people at the San Francisco Conference. We respectfully submit that it is necessary to recognize the distinction between the Hebrews of Europe and Palestine, on the one hand, and the vague term "the Jewish people" on the other. The

latter term cannot refer to any political or national entity. The Jews of the world are adherents of a religious faith, fully comparable to Catholics or Protestants. They are nationals of many countries and as such are fully represented at the World Security Conference by the delegates of their respective countries—except when they happen to be at the same time Hebrews, which is to say, except when they owe political allegiance to no other sovereignty but the Hebrews.

The Hebrew Committee of National Liberation, whose members have no national affiliation other than to the Hebrew people, shares the disappointment of the American Jewish organizations that although all the United Nations, large and small, will foregather on that historic occasion when the peace and well-being of all the world for centuries to come is to be shaped, the one people constrainedly absent will be the people which has suffered more casualties in this war than most of the other nations combined; the one whose surviving population has been most afflicted and made destitute, and the one most in need of reconstruction and rehabilitation; the one people which has been repeatedly made the scapegoat for the world's ills and thus provided the aggressor nations a tragic vehicle for the disturbance of world peace.

The retention of the status quo with regard to the Hebrew people is in itself a threat to world peace, for Fascist forces in all European countries will again utilize anti-Semitism as a weapon for destroying democratic governments and menacing international security.

In 1933 the Germans began their butchery of Jews who were Axis citizens. The world shut its ears to warnings that the butchery was not going to stop with Jews. Today millions of the best youth of many nations are dead because this warning was not heeded and the activity of the German murderers was not curbed before it spread. We feel duty bound to sound another warning today. The German nation-murderers have created a precedent which carries in it all the threats of neobarbarism in which nations will try not merely to subjugate other nations and conquer their territory, but in which nations will endeavor to bring about the extermination of entire segments of populations. If humanity and civilization are to survive, this system must be fundamentally altered. Maintaining the status quo of the so-called Jewish problem, after the mass murder of over 50 percent of the total Hebrew population in Europe, would mean to leave in existence a free zone for crime and extermination. Within this free zone the philosophy of barbarism would continue to feed itself on its own cruelties and make the coming peace only an armistice which is sure to be followed by another war, just as surely as the present war followed the last.

This is one of the issues that must be faced squarely at the conference in San Francisco. And the Hebrew people must be given the opportunity to present their views as to what constitutes a permanent and effective determination of the problem that has plagued them for centuries and now threatens the future of world peace. They must be granted the same degree of self-determination within the general program of international adjustment as will be freely accorded other small nations. There must be an end to the lack of status that for 2,000 years has kept this people an anomaly among the nations of the world.

The Hebrew Committee of National Liberation believes that considerations of world peace in our time, as well as the dictates of humanity and justice, make it imperative to place this problem on the agenda of the United Nations Conference and to grant the Hebrew delegation full and equal rights

of participation in the deliberations that will determine the life of the Hebrews today and the fate of their children tomorrow.

Jewish organizations in the United States or in Great Britain—however sympathetic their attitude to the woes of their co-religionists in the Hebrew nation—cannot represent that nation without violating the principle of national representation on which the World Security Conference is based, and without jeopardizing the position of their members as British or American citizens.

We are certain that Americans of Jewish faith do not desire any other representation at the San Francisco Conference than the delegation appointed by President Roosevelt. Similarly, Englishmen of Jewish faith are satisfied with the British representation at that conference. In fact, we have no doubt that there will be a number of delegates of Jewish faith in the various delegations at this conference. To cite but one example, the United States delegation includes the Honorable SOL BLOOM, chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, a most distinguished Jewish layman.

Unofficial bodies like the World Jewish Congress, the American Jewish Congress, the American Jewish Conference, the American Jewish Committee, the Board of Deputies of British Jews, the Jewish Agency for Palestine, and a half-dozen similar organizations cannot serve as a substitute for the direct and official representation of the Hebrew nation in the deliberations of this conference. On the contrary, they will tend to increase the misunderstanding and confusion that characterize the general attitude toward the Hebrew problem and its solution.

The tragic results of such confusion at the Peace Conference in Versailles at the end of the First World War can be counted in the millions of Hebrew corpses throughout all of Europe and the additional millions of starving and destitute survivors in whose name we appeal to you for justice and equality.

These people will not be otherwise represented at the security conference. They are Hebrews and belong to no other nation. (They are in two categories now commonly referred to as "stateless Jews" and "ex-enemy Jews".) They have a moral right and a desperate need to be represented, for the lack of a world security system in the past has brought upon them the greatest disaster. They have a definite contribution to make to the attainment of a world based on true justice, without which there can be no true peace.

I ask to be forgiven, Mr. Secretary, for the unconventional character of this communication. Having had the honor and privilege of discussing on several occasions various aspects of this problem with you and other members of the American Cabinet, I feel confident—and all my colleagues share this confidence—that you will understand our sense of desperation at the present plight of our nation and our great hope, based on the high admiration we have for the people and Government of the United States, that this frank appeal will result in understanding and assistance.

I view of the complexity of this situation, we take the liberty of suggesting, Mr. Secretary, that pending your consideration and answer to our request, you appoint a small ad hoc committee to make a complete survey of this situation and to which members and experts of the Hebrew committee will be able to submit in full detail proposals for an adequate solution of this vexing problem, the urgency of which can no longer be denied.

To such a committee we could submit the details of our proposed composition of the Hebrew delegation to San Francisco, to include representatives of Hebrew Palestine and Hebrews of occupied Europe who are

veterans of 4 years of struggle against the Axis as part of the Hebrew underground.

I beg to remain, Mr. Secretary,

Faithfully yours,

PETER H. BERGSON,  
Chairman.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 105) to extend the life of the Smaller War Plants Corporation, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2252) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 43) authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Document No. 143, current session, entitled "Further Prosecution of the War," an address of the President of the United States, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

#### EXTENSION OF SELECTIVE TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT OF 1940

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2625) to extend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered yesterday by the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] on behalf of himself, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON].

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hoey	Radcliffe
Austin	Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb
Barkley	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Bridges	La Follette	Russell
Briggs	Langer	Saltonstall
Brooks	Lucas	Shipstead
Bushfield	McCarran	Smith
Capehart	McClellan	Stewart
Capper	McFarland	Taft
Chandler	McKellar	Taylor
Connally	McMahon	Thomas, Utah
Cordon	Magnuson	Tobey
Donnell	Maybank	Tunnell
Ellender	Millikin	Vandenberg
Ferguson	Moore	Walsh
Fulbright	Morse	Wheeler
George	Murdock	Wherry
Hart	Myers	White
Hatch	O'Daniel	Wiley
Hawkes	O'Mahoney	Willis
Hayden	Overton	Wilson
Hickenlooper	Pepper	Young

Mr. BARKLEY. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Rhode Is-

land [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are absent on public business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are attending committee meetings and public business pertaining to their respective States.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HART] is detained on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HATCH in the chair). Sixty-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I understand that the pending business is the amendment proposed by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], and myself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that the pending business before the Senate is the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee, in behalf of himself, the Senator from West Virginia, the Senator from Iowa, and the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. STEWART. I understand that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] wishes to be heard on a motion to have the Senate temporarily lay aside the unfinished business. I yield to him for that purpose. Before the motion is put, I should like to discuss it.

#### AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1946

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, if it is possible to make arrangements to do so, I am anxious to have the Senate consent to proceed to the consideration of the agricultural appropriation bill, House bill 2689. I do not think consideration of the bill will consume any great amount of time. There are no highly controversial questions in the bill, so far as I know. There are a number of amendments. It is important that the bill be passed and go to conference at the earliest possible date; otherwise we shall have in conference a number of bills, with the same conferees on the part of the Senate, and thus there will be likelihood of delay in the enactment of all the appropriation bills.

I have discussed the matter with the Senator from Utah, who is in charge of the unfinished business. He has very kindly stated that he has no objection to laying aside temporarily the pending bill,



in order that the Senate may proceed to the consideration of the agricultural appropriation bill.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 2689, the agricultural appropriation bill for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—although, of course, I shall not do so—I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia approximately how long he thinks it will take to dispose of the agricultural appropriation bill?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I would be the greatest prophet of all history, both modern and of antiquity, if I could make any prediction with respect to the bill. I have seen reported to the Senate agricultural appropriation bills the consideration of which I did not think would take over an hour, but they were debated for several days. I remember one occasion when the committee brought such a bill to the floor, fully anticipating that its consideration would take at least a week, but the bill passed the Senate within an hour. I cannot venture any prediction, or at least I cannot give the Senator from Tennessee any assurance as to how long the consideration of the bill would take. My opinion is that its consideration would not take more than 35 or 40 minutes. I know of no real controversy about any item in the bill. But I have seen very violent controversies arise out of a very clear and sunlit sky in the Senate, and I cannot give my friend any assurance about the amount of time consideration of the bill would take.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I asked for such a statement from the Senator from Georgia because there are several Senators who wish to discuss the amendment to the bill extending the Selective Service Act, which is the pending business. I would suggest that consideration of the bill which has been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs by the Senator from Utah go over until tomorrow, if there is a possibility that the debate in connection with consideration of the agricultural appropriation bill will be quite lengthy. However, I appreciate that the Senator from Georgia can have no definite idea regarding how long consideration of the agricultural appropriation bill may take.

Mr. RUSSELL. My best judgment is that consideration of the agricultural appropriation bill will not require more than 40 minutes, unless some controversy which I cannot now foresee arises.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me at this point?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. In connection with what the Senator from Tennessee has just said, I hope the agricultural appropriation bill can be speedily disposed of, and that we may soon resume consideration of the pending legislation. As all Members of the Senate know, the selective service or draft law expires on the 15th day of May, and time is running against it. So it is important that we pass the bill providing for extension of

the Selective Training and Service Act as soon as possible.

I hope Senators will understand that immediately upon conclusion of consideration of the agricultural appropriation bill we shall resume consideration of the draft-extension bill. I should not like to see its consideration go over until tomorrow, because I hope we shall not have to have a session on Saturday, and that we may be able to dispose of the draft-extension bill tomorrow, if not today. I had hoped that we might dispose of it today. Of course, in view of the interposition of the agricultural appropriation bill, we may not be able to do so.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not think passage of the draft bill will be delayed on account of agreeing to my unanimous-consent request.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I did not hear the unanimous-consent request propounded; but if it was in the usual form, I simply wish to say to the Senator from Tennessee that he or any other Senator would have some control of the situation, because by demanding the regular order he could bring the other bill back for consideration.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I always consult with the majority leader before undertaking to bring any proposed legislation before the Senate. I spoke to him yesterday about this matter. I have no disposition to delay consideration of the bill providing for extension of the draft. I think every Member of the Senate fully appreciates the fact that it is absolutely vital to the prosecution of the war. However, as a matter of fact, under the rules appropriation bills do have priority. I did not claim that priority. I am not insisting on it now. If we run into any great difficulty during consideration of the agricultural appropriation bill, I shall not complain if it is laid aside and if the Senate returns to consideration of the draft-extension bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Georgia?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2689) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. RUSSELL. I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that the bill be read for amendment, and that the amendments of the committee be first considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered; and the clerk will proceed to state the amendments reported by the Committee on Appropriations.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Department of Agriculture—Penalty mail," on page 4, line 7, after "(Public Law 364)", to strike out "\$3,238,740" and insert "\$3,418,670"; in line 8, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$27,000" and insert "\$30,000"; and in line 11, after the word "Corporation",

to insert a comma and "and the amount authorized for penalty mail for said Corporation in the First Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1945, for the fiscal year 1945 is hereby increased by \$12,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Office of the Solicitor," on page 4, line 20, after the word "service", to strike out "\$1,680,000" and insert "\$1,808,500"; and on page 5, line 3, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$883,240" and insert "\$944,240."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Office of Information—Salaries and expenses," on page 5, line 23, before the word "together", to strike out "\$450,000" and insert "\$453,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Agricultural Economics," on page 10, line 18, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$1,833,589" and insert "\$1,920,079."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, line 11, before the word "together", to strike out "\$2,010,000" and insert "\$2,110,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, line 18, before the word "together", to strike out "\$1,520,000" and insert "\$1,670,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Agricultural Research Administration—Office of Administrator," on page 17, line 8, after the figures "\$5,000", to strike out "the total amount for construction of buildings costing more than \$2,500 each shall be within the limits of the estimates submitted and approved therefor."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of Experiment Stations—Payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico," on page 18, line 24, after "(7 U. S. C. 427-427g)", to strike out "\$2,463,708" and insert "\$3,000,000"; on page 19, line 8, after the name "Alaska" where it occurs the first time, to strike out "\$22,500" and insert "\$32,500"; in line 9, before the name "Puerto Rico", to strike out "\$37,500" and insert "\$47,500"; and in line 13, after the name "Puerto Rico", to strike out "\$7,001,208" and insert "\$7,547,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Animal Industry—Salaries and expenses," on page 21, line 7, after the word "hatcheries", to strike out "\$840,000" and insert "\$855,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Dairy Industry," on page 25, line 8, after the word "butter", to strike out "\$722,300" and insert "\$742,300."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils, and Agricultural Engineering—Salaries and expenses," on page 26, line 9, after the word "crops", to strike out "\$1,971,400" and insert "\$1,983,900."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, line 16, after the word "control", to strike out "\$252,700" and insert "\$262,700."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, line 13, after the word "products" to strike out "\$333,000" and insert "\$528,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was under the subhead "Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine—Salaries and expenses," on page 29, line 15, after the word "application", to strike out "\$2,082,000" and insert "\$2,114,900."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, line 8, after "(7 U. S. C. 166)", to strike out "\$2,235,800" and insert "\$2,390,800."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Forest Service—Salaries and expenses," on page 35, line 25, before the word "for", to strike out "\$820,861" and insert "\$854,181."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 39, line 7, after the word "forests", to strike out "\$16,349,100" and insert "\$16,999,100."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 40, line 6, after the word "elsewhere", to strike out "\$520,900" and insert "\$970,900."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 40, line 10, after the word "elsewhere", to strike out "\$325,000" and insert "\$337,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 40, line 13, after the word "elsewhere", to strike out "\$1,001,380" and insert "\$1,228,900."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Forest roads and trails," on page 42, line 18, after "administration, (1)", to strike out "\$4,418,778" and insert "\$7,418,778"; in line 20, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$68,846" and insert "\$98,846"; in line 22, after the word "maintenance", to insert "and reconstruction"; on page 43, line 1, after the words "in all", to strike out "\$5,918,778" and insert "\$8,918,778"; in line 9, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$7,500" and insert "\$10,000"; and in line 11, after the word "was", to strike out "\$7,500" and insert "\$10,000."

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to return for a moment to the amendment on page 43 in line 1 and ask that an explanation be made of it.

Mr. RUSSELL. The item to which the Senator from Nebraska refers, appearing on the top of page 43, is the total of certain items appearing on page 42.

Mr. WHERRY. What is the purpose of the appropriation?

Mr. RUSSELL. The appropriation is for the purpose of increasing the amount available for the construction of forest trails. The amount allowed by the Senate is considerably under the Budget Bureau estimate, but more than was

agreed to by the House. The Senate committee allowed the increase because of the necessity for increasing the production of lumber in connection with the war effort. With the exception of some private holdings in the Pacific Northwest, the principal reserves of available lumber are in the Government forests. It is impossible to get the timber out of those forest areas without building roads and trails so that the lumber can be brought down from the hills. The use of lumber from the national forests during the past 2 years has been considerable, and those areas represent the principal sources of our lumber for use in connection with the war effort.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. GERRY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	Myers
Austin	Hatch	O'Daniel
Barkley	Hawkes	O'Mahoney
Bilbo	Hayden	Overton
Briggs	Hickenlooper	Reed
Brooks	Hoey	Revercomb
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Byrd	La Follette	Stewart
Capehart	Lucas	Taft
Capper	McCarran	Taylor
Chandler	McClellan	Tunnell
Chavez	McFarland	Tydings
Connally	McKellar	Vandenberg
Donnell	McMahon	Walsh
Ellender	Magnuson	Wherry
Ferguson	Maybank	White
Fulbright	Mitchell	Wiley
George	Morse	Wilson
Gerry	Murdock	Young
Guffey	Murray	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. PEPPER subsequently said: Mr. President, I wish to have the RECORD show that I answered the first quorum call after the Senate convened this morning, and at the time of the second quorum call I was conferring with some of my constituents in the Senate reception room. I wanted the RECORD to show that I had not been delinquent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment reported by the Committee on Appropriations.

The next amendment was, under the heading "War Food Administration," on page 45, line 10, after the name "District of Columbia", to strike out "\$13,636,472" and insert "\$14,986,472"; and in line 22, after the word "commodity", to insert "or, where the producers of a number of commodities compete for labor, a majority of such competing producers considered as a group."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Commodity Credit Corporation," on page 46, at the beginning of line 5, to strike out "\$6,562,000" and insert "\$6,565,000"; and in line 24, after the word "hereof", to strike out the comma and "but not more than \$1,600,000 may be expended under this head."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Conservation and use of agri-

cultural land resources," on page 49, line 3, after the word "periodicals", to strike out "\$290,000,000" and insert "\$300,000,000"; in line 4, after the word "with", to strike out "\$10,000,000" and insert "\$13,000,000"; at the beginning of line 7, to strike out "\$300,000,000" and insert "\$313,000,000"; in line 20, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$21,911,200" and insert "\$22,911,200"; in line 23, after the word "than", to strike out "\$5,382,103" and insert "\$6,382,103."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 50, line 14, after the word "amended", to insert "the total expenditures of which, including administration, shall be \$300,000,000."

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the amendment just stated under the heading "Conservation and use of agricultural land resources" did not appear in the bill as passed by the House of Representatives, and, therefore, the House passed the agricultural appropriation bill without specifying to the Department of Agriculture how large their soil-conservation program could be during the fiscal year 1936.

The Bureau of the Budget recommended a figure two-thirds of the size of the figure agreed on by the Senate Appropriations Committee. In other words, the recommendation of the Senate Appropriations Committee as to next year's program is that it shall total the same as the 1945 program, while the Bureau of the Budget recommended that next year's program should be \$200,000,000, and not the larger sum of \$300,000,000, which is the figure of the Senate Appropriations Committee.

I should like to have the Senator from Georgia (Mr. RUSSELL), who is in charge of the bill, explain the figure. Of course, I attended closely the Senate committee hearings and know in my own mind the reason for the action taken by the Senate Appropriations Committee, but I still would like to have in the RECORD some justification for the \$300,000,000 figure.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the sum of \$300,000,000 represents the best opinion of the majority of the members of the committee as to the proper size for the soil-conservation program for next year.

Under the basic act providing for a soil-conservation program the sum suggested is \$500,000,000. That amount was appropriated for years. Year before last, in view of the increasing farm income of the country and the fact that the requirements of war were compelling the farmers to plant more land to soil-depleting crops, such as wheat, oats, and other grains, and crops which were necessary for the production of vegetable oil, such as peanuts, the program was reduced from \$500,000,000 to \$400,000,000. Last year the sum was reduced another \$100,000,000 and only \$300,000,000 was appropriated.

I might say, Mr. President, that no opposition to these reductions in the sum



of \$200,000,000 below the statutory authorization developed in the Appropriations Committee of either House of the Congress.

This year the Budget Bureau, following the lead of Congress in reducing this appropriation by \$100,000,000 each year, proposed a program of \$200,000,000 for soil-conservation purposes next year. The House committee conducted exhaustive hearings on that subject. They went into it very fully and stated in the committee report that they regarded the limitation of \$200,000,000 as too small to enable the Department to carry on a comprehensive soil-conservation program all over the United States, and they therefore eliminated from the bill the suggested limitation of \$200,000,000.

It can readily be seen where that left the Department of Agriculture in preparing a soil-conservation program for 1946. The amount authorized by law as proper for the soil-conservation program was \$500,000,000.

Congress had reduced that amount to \$300,000,000, and without some figure in the bill the Department would be on either horn of the dilemma, would have to conduct a program for half a billion dollars, as the act authorizes, or go to the \$200,000,000 which the Budget has estimated, but which the House committee said was too small.

Mr. President, this item was discussed very thoroughly in the subcommittee and in the full Committee on Appropriations. The majority of the members of the committee did not believe that the program should be reduced below the current figure of \$300,000,000 a year. Senators should bear in mind that the appropriation has been reduced by \$200,000,000 already.

The soil-conservation program is one of the most important activities of the Department of Agriculture. I think that most anyone who is familiar with conditions on the farms in this Nation will realize that this program has served a wonderful purpose in developing the fertility of our soil, and in restoring the fertility of soil that was depleted by the haphazard farming practices which have obtained heretofore.

In the enactment of the soil-conservation program the Congress of the United States stated as a national policy that the entire Nation had a stake in maintaining the fertility of our soils, which were being so rapidly depleted, lest generations which come after us would have to live on land where it was impossible to grow sufficient crops and fibers with which to sustain life and clothe themselves.

In my opinion, Mr. President, \$300,000,000 is about as small an amount as we can grant and keep the soil-conservation program alive. If the desire is to kill the program altogether, and make the payments for soil conservation practices so small that the farmers cannot afford to participate in the program, we can either eliminate it or reduce it.

Mr. President, I wish to point out—and I shall now conclude—that the Farm Bureau Federation appeared before the committee and urged that this program be made \$350,000,000. Mr. Marvin Jones, who is the War Food Administrator, testified that he did not believe a \$200,000,-

000 program could be effective, and that \$300,000,000 was as low as we could make the appropriation and maintain the program, and keep up the interest in the enthusiasm of the farmers of the United States in its success. I feel that it would be a very grave error to reduce the amount below the \$300,000,000.

It might be said that the farm income is much higher than it has ever been, and that is quite true, but let us bear in mind that over the years which have come and gone, when the farmer was depleting his soil and his capital investment to the tune of \$18,000,000,000, because his prices were so far below parity, the soils were exhausted, and it is only through a comprehensive, Nation-wide program such as we now have in effect that we may hope to maintain the farms of this country so as to enable us to support the life of the Republic.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President—  
The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. I do not feel like making a motion to reduce the appropriation at this time, but I ask the Senator from Georgia if he would be willing to accept an amendment along the line I am about to suggest? He will notice the language in line 15 provides that the total expenditures "shall be \$300,000,000." Would the Senator be willing to accept an amendment changing the wording so that it would read "the total expenditures of which, including administration, shall not be more than \$300,000,000"?

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall be happy to accept an amendment to the effect that it shall not exceed \$300,000,000. I think that is the language we usually employ in these appropriations. I should have no objection to that.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I offer the amendment to change the wording on line 15, page 50, so that the language would read "the total expenditures for which, including administration, shall not exceed \$300,000,000."

Mr. RUSSELL. I have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. GURNEY. I thank the Senator.  
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment to the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment, on page 50, line 15, it is proposed, after the word "administration" and the comma, to strike out the word "be" and to insert the words "not exceed."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Marketing service", on page 59, line 5, after the word "products", to strike out "\$1,114,900" and insert "\$1,125,300."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation", on page 63, line 19, after

the word "amended", to strike out "\$22,357,264" and insert "\$22,720,549."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 65, line 5, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$67,500,000" and insert "\$100,000,000", and in line 6, after the amendment just above stated, to insert a colon and "Provided, That in the selection of new borrowers for rural rehabilitation loans authorized under the caption 'Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation' veterans shall be given preference."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 66, line 20, after the word "services", to insert a colon and the following proviso: "Provided, That, in assisting farmers in the organization and administration of associations and groups for medical care, the Farm Security Administration shall permit the associations or groups to have free choice in the selection of practitioners from those available practitioners who are licensed under State laws."

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, during the last session of Congress we discussed this matter quite extensively. When a bill was before the Senate last year—and the Senator from Georgia will correct me if I am in error—I offered an amendment giving free choice to the clients under this set-up to select their own medical advisers. The amendment was agreed to unanimously by the Senate, it went to the House and was changed completely. When we resumed our session on September 8, as I recall the date, the Senator from Georgia asked me if I would not defer pressing the amendment in the Senate again because of the lateness of the season. I acceded, and the distinguished Senator from Georgia made this comment on the floor of the Senate at that time. He said, in a colloquy with me:

I certainly would be the last one to wish to see any borrower from the Farm Security Administration coerced or intimidated or even channelized in the selection of his doctor in connection with any loans which may be made to medical cooperatives. This provision will, of course, not affect the present year's operation, but I shall hope to be able to cooperate with the Senator and with the officials of the Farm Security Administration and all others interested to see that there is no coercion or intimidation of the borrowers, and that they shall have freedom of choice to select the doctor they wish to serve them.

Mr. President, that was the amendment which was unanimously adopted by the Senate last year, which permitted the members of cooperative organizations to have a free choice of their own doctors.

I grant that the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] has been fair in this matter. He has been helpful; he has been cooperative; he did obtain some concessions from the committee; but it seems to me, Mr. President, from the wording of the amendment which has just been read that it does not leave a free choice to the individual members of the cooperative associations. It leaves the matter up to the associations themselves. It is well known to those who are familiar with this set-up in the Farm Security Administration that a cooperative association as a whole can be dominated and is dominated by the men who run it. Specifically, the members can make a

choice by way of a cooperative association acting together, but what possibility is there for one farmer in a certain township who has received a loan from the Federal Security Administration to get together with the other farmers in his county and in other townships to decide jointly upon this matter? It seems to me that not only in accordance with the American principle of free choice for the individual, but in fairness to the men themselves when they are obliged to call a doctor they should be able to call the doctor they want. They do not want Tom, Dick, or Harry, with whom they have no association. They want the doctor with whom they are familiar, who has brought their children into the world; who has cared for members of their families in their last illnesses. They want to have a free choice of the doctor.

Mr. President, I move to amend the committee amendment on page 66, in line 23, following the article "the", the third word in the line, by inserting the words "members of the", so the language will be "shall permit the members of the associations or groups to have free choice."

I move that amendment so that the members themselves may have a free choice without the association as a whole having to meet and vote on the question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment to the committee amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 66, in line 23, in the committee amendment, after the word "the", it is proposed to insert the words "members of the."

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the Senator from South Dakota has stated substantially the history of this amendment. Of course, the Senator offered the original amendment to a legislative bill, and the amendment was not printed, as I understand. It was offered from the floor. I happened to be in charge of that legislative bill, and I accepted the amendment, so it was in fact approved unanimously. I am still in favor of the theory the Senator expounds here, but the method by which he approaches it can have no other effect than to destroy absolutely these cooperative health associations which have been sponsored by the Farm Security Administration, and which have meant so much to the health of the poorer and more underprivileged people who live on the farms in this country.

On its face the Senator's proposal is fair, and when we went into conference on the legislative bill last year I urged the Senator's amendment on the House conferees. I had not analyzed it as carefully as I should have done. Under the Senator's amendment it would be impossible in effect to organize any of these health associations.

The method of their organization is as follows: The people who have borrowed money from the Farm Security Administration organize a medical cooperative to secure medical care for themselves and their families. There is nothing compulsory in the first place about a person joining one of these associations. It is entirely optional with the borrower from the Farm Security Administration as to whether he shall go into a health association or not.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I agree with the distinguished Senator that there is no way to force the individual to join such an association, but if the farmer is poor enough so he feels obliged to borrow money from the Farm Security Administration, that in itself provides sufficient coercion.

Mr. RUSSELL. I might go further and say that there is nothing in the articles of association which would deprive a borrower from the Farm Security Administration of the right to use the money he has borrowed to pay any doctor he sees fit to employ. The question of free choice, which the Senator so eloquently expounds, therefore, is not involved in this proposition. The whole purpose of these associations is to secure cheaper medical care for these poor people. An association is organized and the borrowers who wish to come into the association may do so. Then the association contracts with one or two or three doctors in the community, at a lower rate of pay than that which usually applies, or a lower schedule of fees. The whole thing has been approved by the American Medical Association. The whole theory of the association is approved by the medical group because of the dire need of the people who are members of the association. If a member of an association has need for a doctor he calls upon the doctor who is the other contracting party whom he desires to use in case of illness in his family. There we have a contract between members of the association, who are one party to the contract, and certain doctors who are the other contracting parties.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I am sure the Senator will agree with me that the employment of a doctor for the treatment of himself and his family is a peculiarly personal matter.

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, yes; there is no question about that.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. An individual does not take kindly to the idea that simply because he is poor and must borrow money from the Government, the Government, or representatives of the Government, shall decide for him what doctor he shall have. I insist that he have a free choice in the matter.

Mr. RUSSELL. He has a free choice, and the Senator's argument is very misleading. There is absolutely nothing on earth which prevents freedom of choice on the part of any borrower, a member of an association, from going to any doctor of any school of practice, whether he be an allopath, an osteopath, or a chiropractor, with whom he is familiar and secure his services. He can proceed to pay that doctor just as any other American citizen would, and he can pay him out of his loan.

What I am trying to do is to assure fair treatment between the allopath, the osteopath, and the chiropractor wherever they are recognized and allowed to practice under the laws of a State. The amendment which I have prepared and

which the committee brought in here will do just that.

The Senator from South Dakota refers to freedom of choice. Under the committee amendment individuals have absolute democratic action within the association. I have heard from men whom I have no reason to disbelieve, who have said that in some sections of the country the Farm Security Administration has refused to contract with certain doctors unless they happen to be of particular schools and are members of certain State associations. Under the pending committee amendment they would not be permitted to do that. If a majority of the members of an association wish to contract with a chiropractor or with an osteopath or with any other kind of doctor who is recognized to practice by the State laws, they can do so.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I cannot subscribe to the distinguished Senator's assertion that the farmers have absolutely free choice. The Senator himself stated that a choice was made by a majority of the members of a cooperative.

Mr. RUSSELL. No; I had not stated that.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. That was the statement in substance. The Senator agrees that a majority of the members of a cooperative decide what doctor they will hire; does he not?

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, yes; of course I do.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Very well. That is not free choice.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator presents an argument about free choice, when there is nothing on earth that compels any person to remain in one of these cooperative associations. If an individual wants a doctor other than the doctor of the cooperative, let us say he wants a chiropractor, he can resign from the association and hire a chiropractor, or any other doctor on earth he wants to hire. The benefit that comes from being a member of the association comes from the fact that the individual can get medical service at a cheaper rate than otherwise. There is nothing that compels an individual to take a certain doctor. The benefit comes to the member from receiving medical service at a lower cost.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Farm Security Administration also lend him money to pay doctors' bills directly?

Mr. RUSSELL. It certainly will.

Mr. TAFT. I think the harm in it is not so much in lending to the cooperative as in deliberately organizing farm cooperatives, as the Farm Security Administration has done in the past, for health insurance.

Mr. RUSSELL. That may have been done.

Mr. TAFT. That sort of organization has been deliberately stimulated, as against the physician in private practice. If there is no discrimination, and if the Farm Security Administration is just as



willing to lend money to pay the doctors' bills of a borrower who is not a member of an association, I do not see any great harm in it.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not mean that the Farm Security Administration will lend a man any amount of money to pay doctors' bills; but a borrower may use his loan, within the limits of the loan, to pay a doctor, just as he might pay any other expense. The fact is that when he is in the association he receives the benefit of a reduced rate and an assurance of service. There is no compulsion on an individual to join the association, so it cannot be said that he is denied freedom of choice.

Mr. TAFT. The only question is whether he is or not. Of course, he should not be denied freedom of choice. The question is whether the Farm Security Administration has, as a practical matter, forced people into this kind of cooperative association. I ask the Senator whether or not that is true.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not know of any case in which that is true; but I would not say it has not happened in some isolated case. I presume that those in the Farm Security Administration at the county level are very much like human beings everywhere. They may recommend their own doctors to the association. But I do not believe that we can afford to write into the law a provision which I believe would have the effect of nullifying the benefits of the association merely because of some abuse of administrative discretion on the part of a minor employee somewhere in the United States. I do not believe that that is sufficient ground to justify the proposed amendment.

The committee amendment absolutely protects the interest of any doctor of any faith or cult if the majority of the members of the association wish him to be one of the contracting parties. It must be understood that the contract is not usually made with one doctor. It is usually made with several doctors.

The effect of the Senator's amendment, if it were adopted, would be to say that an individual could join one of these medical associations, and if he were not pleased with the selection of doctors by the majority, he could destroy the association by insisting upon a doctor of his choice. He could absolutely nullify and destroy the benefits to a majority of the members of the association. I do not believe that we wish to go that far.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. It is my understanding that this medical insurance or medical assistance program is a sort of mutual cooperative agreement between the doctors of a community—or, as in the case of my State, the whole State—and the members of the Farm Security Association, who would naturally deal through the Farm Security Administration.

We all know that country doctors have a great deal of money due them from poor farm families. In fact, most country doctors die with a good share of that money still due them. So when the Farm Security Administration came forward

and said, "We will lend our members \$20 a year for the purpose of joining this cooperative health program," the doctors got together and said, "We will take care of the families." So far as I know, each family in my State calls on its family doctor, as usual. The doctors said, "We will take care of those families. They will pay what they can; and what they cannot pay we will prorate among ourselves." We will divide the loss among ourselves." I believe that is the way in which the program has worked. As I say, the program in my State is on a State-wide scale. I believe that Vermont is the only State which has the health program on a State-wide scale. It has worked very well.

I can fully sympathize with the aims of the Senator from South Dakota. I believe that justice is on his side. However, there is also a practical side of the question. We hear that if this provision is so worded as to permit the individual Farm Security member to call upon his chiropractor or his osteopath, members of the medical fraternity will refuse to cooperate, and will not enter into these programs. Of course, that is not a very broad-minded attitude to take; but it seems to me that we must look at the practical side of it.

I should like to see some method devised whereby the suggestion of the Senator from South Dakota would work; but I do not know how it could be done. The Medical Association is one of the closest unions in the United States. Its members must abide pretty strictly by its rules, or they get into difficulties. So I would not wish to take the chance, even in order to extend justice to all these people, of depriving many of the other members of the Farm Security Association of the benefits which they are now receiving. The situation is unfortunate. I wish there were some way out of it, but I do not know of any. For that reason, I shall support the Senator from Georgia, although I have full sympathy, as I had a year ago, with the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Vermont that I have endeavored to the very best of my ability to go along with the Senator from South Dakota and be as fair as I could with him and with all the members of the other medical groups, without destroying the health associations. Under the express terms of the amendment reported by the committee, any of the associations which wishes to do so can contract with any kind of doctor. An association can be formed to contract with doctors belonging to any of the various cults.

Mr. AIKEN. That is true in the legal sense; but I still agree with the Senator from South Dakota that the Farm Security Administration leaders would have the final say as to what the vote should be.

Mr. RUSSELL. That might be.

Mr. AIKEN. The members of the association would ask the advice of the Farm Security Administration. They would not consider that they were being coerced, because in a great many cases they would not know what to do.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. First of all, I wish to make it perfectly clear, after what the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Georgia have said, that I am not interested in any practitioner or group of practitioners. My interest is in the borrowers themselves, those who are poor and have to apply to the Government for money with which to support themselves. But if I ever saw an example of socialized medicine in my life, it is the proposal which the Senator from Georgia now makes. I am opposed to socialized medicine. I want the American citizen, whoever he is or wherever he may be, to have the absolute right to say, "I want John Smith for my doctor, and not some doctor designated by the Farm Security Administration."

Mr. RUSSELL. The individual has that absolute right today. There is not a thing in the world to prevent him from having John Smith as his doctor if he wants him. But if he has entered into a contract with Bill Brown for medical services—

Mr. BUSHFIELD. He does not make the contract.

Mr. RUSSELL. He does make the contract.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. If the distinguished Senator from Georgia will listen for a moment, the contract is made by a majority of the cooperative association itself, and not by the individual. The association as a whole is operated by officials of the Farm Security Administration.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, there is nothing which would require a person to remain in the association. The committee amendment is offered as the result of an earnest and honest effort on my part to go as far as I could to meet the views of the Senator from South Dakota without destroying these very important group-health units which have been organized within the Farm Security Administration. But if the Senator believes that the committee amendment offends more than does the present system, I will be very happy to see that the amendment never becomes law. It can be very easily receded from. I myself will vote against it, and it will not be accepted in the conference.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I am very appreciative of the cooperation of the distinguished Senator in going as far as he has gone; but I do not think he has gone far enough.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think we went a long way.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. The decision has been left with the association itself, and not with the individual. I want to give it back to the individual.

Mr. RUSSELL. It is not possible to do that, because if an individual is a member of a cooperative association under the Farm Security Administration to buy farm machinery, for example, the association contracts with John Deere, Allis-Chalmers, or some other concern, to buy tractors. The individual may want an Allis-Chalmers tractor, and not a John Deere tractor; but if he is a member

of the association he must take the tractor from the concern with which the association has entered into a contract. He has no freedom of choice. If he joins the association, he knows in advance that he must use Allis-Chalmers machinery, or the machinery of the concern with which the association has a contract. If a man joins one of these medical societies, he knows in advance the names of the doctors whose services will be available to him. As a matter of fact, there is nothing on earth which interferes with freedom of choice, any more than a man voluntarily limits his choice by entering into a contract.

Mr. REED rose.

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rose to say exactly what the Senator from Georgia has said. Groups for medical treatment are being organized in my State of Kansas. They are widely organized in the neighboring State of Oklahoma. No man has to join one of them if he does not wish to do so, regardless of whether he is a borrower from the Federal Security Agency. However, if he goes into such a group and thus secures medical attention at reduced rates, he limits his individual choice to the choice of the majority of the group. There is no other way by which group action can be conducted. No man is forced to join a group; but once he joins, of course, the majority, as in any democratic institution, determines the policy. If the man does not like it, he can drop out.

I fear that the Senator from South Dakota is not wholly reasonable in his attitude on this matter, although I beg his pardon for having to say so.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I should like to ask whether the Senator from Kansas believes in socialized medicine.

Mr. REED. No, sir.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. That is what the Senator will be getting under this bill.

Mr. REED. Oh, no. Oklahoma is as good an illustration of the operation of group medicine as there is in this country. It is growing in my State.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator from Kansas that the American Medical Association appointed a committee to examine into this system, and it has been approved by the group which is leading the fight against socialized medicine in this country.

Mr. REED. I received a letter from a doctor who is a friend of mine asking me to vote thus and so. I said in reply, "Yes; I will vote to let you 'guys' have a closed shop—which is more than I would do for the C. I. O." It was a great joke when that letter was shown around.

Regardless of whether anyone likes it or not, we are going to have more and more group medical attention. Its coming is as certain as anything can be. The American Medical Association has been very restrictive in its rules. I am very happy to see that it is easing its policies. I am happy to see it because it is surely coming. I do not need to join a health group in order to secure

medical attention and hospital services; but when I do join such a group I surrender my individual choice to the extent of having to abide by the policy which the majority of the group desires to adopt.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota to the committee amendment on page 66.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Guffey	Murdock
Austin	Hatch	Murray
Bankhead	Hawkes	Myers
Barkley	Hayden	Pepper
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Reed
Briggs	Hoey	Revercomb
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Smith
Byrd	Langer	Stewart
Capper	Lucas	Taylor
Chandler	McClellan	Tunnell
Chavez	McFarland	Vandenberg
Connally	McKellar	Wagner
Cordon	McMahon	Walsh
Donnell	Magnuson	Wherry
Ferguson	Maybank	White
Fulbright	Millikin	Wiley
George	Mitchell	Wilson
Gerry	Moore	Young

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Fifty-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. MORSE subsequently said: Mr. President, during the last roll call I was called out of the Senate Chamber for a conference with a constituent who has just completed 66 missions in the South Pacific. From him I received a great deal of advice and information in regard to the legislation pending before the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that my name be listed among those reported as present.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is in doubt whether the RECORD can be so changed. The Senator's statement will appear in the RECORD in connection with the call of the roll. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota to the committee amendment on page 66.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, on page 66, beginning in line 20, the committee proposes to insert the following amendment:

*Provided, That, in assisting farmers in the organization and administration of associations and groups for medical care, the Farm Security Administration shall permit the associations or groups to have free choice in the selection of practitioners from those available practitioners who are licensed under State laws.*

I invite the attention of the Senate to the words "shall permit the associations or groups." I move to amend in line 23, after the words "shall permit the", by inserting "members of the." That would permit not only associations themselves as cooperative organizations, but the members of cooperatives to exercise their individual choice of a doctor if one should be needed.

Mr. HAYDEN. Is it the Senator's idea that each individual member of the group

may make his own contract with a doctor, and that the group will pay the bill?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. No.

Mr. HAYDEN. This is group medical insurance.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. That is correct. The person who becomes a member of the group will naturally pay his share of the group insurance. But suppose he is not satisfied with the doctor who is hired for him and wants to employ a physician of his own selection; under the committee amendment he would be required to pay double for the doctor's services.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is what I say. The individual may make a contract with a doctor without consulting the group, and the doctor whom he employs will be paid by the person who employs him.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Under the committee amendment, if an individual becomes a member of an association he must accept the doctor whom the group employs.

Mr. HAYDEN. In order to secure medical services at cheaper rates, the group would contract with one or more doctors in the county, and they would serve the members of the group.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Whether the services would be cheaper or not is a question open to debate.

Mr. HAYDEN. In any event, in order to secure medical services the group contracts with one or more doctors. If a member of the group who is in need of medical services does not like the doctors with whom the group has contracted, under the Senator's amendment he may contract for the services of a physician of his own selection and the group must pay the bill.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. No; the group is not required to pay the bill. The individual who secures the services of a doctor must himself pay the bill.

Mr. HAYDEN. I am unable to agree with the Senator's interpretation of his amendment.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. This amendment gives every member of a farm security organization the right to certain medical attention.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; but someone must pay for it. Under the Senator's amendment who would pay for it if the group did not pay for it?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell] to clarify the amendment for the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I believe there is considerable confusion in regard to this matter. These groups are not all administered alike. In some groups, under the contract with the doctors, a certain sum of money is paid per member, and the members are furnished medical services during the year. In other groups, because of the lack of financial resources, a reduction in fees is allowed.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Will the Senator permit me to propound a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I am trying to set the Senator from Arizona straight. I think he is in error. If the individual



employs a doctor of his own he must pay for the doctor's services out of his own pocket.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. If he hires a doctor on his own account he must pay for him.

Mr. HAYDEN. If that statement be true, and the doctor is not connected with the group, the group is not responsible for what the doctor does. The Senator from South Dakota has said that a person may join the group and expect to receive the benefits of group medical service; yet he is free to hire any doctor whom he wishes, and the group must pay the bill.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. No; I do not mean that at all.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. According to my interpretation of the Senator's proposed amendment, only individuals of the group would have the right to employ available physicians. The individual would have a right, in his own interest, to employ physicians from among those who were available. Is that the correct interpretation of the amendment?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. No. The word "available" means any available doctor in the community. It does not mean only a doctor who has a contract, for example.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Then, I have misunderstood the purpose of the amendment.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. I am somewhat confused as to just what the Senator from South Dakota intends to accomplish by his amendment. Is it his contention that the members of the association shall have the free right to employ any medical practitioner whom they choose, and, having used such medical services, and having incurred liability for their payment, be reimbursed from group funds?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. No; not at all.

Mr. CORDON. If that is not the purpose, does not every member of every association of this character have a right, as an individual, to hire any doctor whom he wishes to hire?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Yes; if he pays for the services of the doctor.

Mr. CORDON. How would the payment provision operate under the proposed amendment of the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. The individual would pay for the medical services himself. The amendment of the committee grants the right of the association to contract with doctors for their professional services.

Mr. CORDON. Yes.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. In my State the association is usually managed by officers of farm security organizations, not the farmers themselves. The situation became so objectionable at one time in my State, while I was Governor, that our legislature passed a law outlawing the organization then existing there. It had been made a target of unscrupulous

persons, and its activities proved not to be to the welfare of borrowers. What I propose to do by my amendment is to provide that each borrower may, if he so desires, hire his own doctor.

Mr. CORDON. How would the doctor be paid?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. He would be paid by the person who employed him.

Mr. CORDON. Would that person have any right of reimbursement from any funds of the group, or a right of deduction in the amount of the fee he would normally pay?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Not at all. If he becomes a member of the group association he is stuck for his share of the medical expenses. If he wishes to employ a doctor not employed by the group, and goes outside the association to seek medical services, he must pay for them himself. But I maintain that the borrower must have the individual right and liberty to hire his own doctor, whoever he may be.

Mr. CORDON. Then is it the Senator's view that if his amendment be not adopted a member of one of these groups would, if he employed outside medical service, forfeit some other right he had in the group?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Oh, no. He would simply pay for two doctors.

Mr. CORDON. Under the Senator's amendment would he pay for two doctors?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. No; if he did not go into the association. It is not compulsory to go into the association at all; but if he does go in then he has got to pay the proportionate share of the association's fee for medical service. If he proceeds on his own and hires a doctor he pays that out of his own pocket.

Mr. CORDON. Then the purpose sought by the Senator is by giving the right to an individual to select his own medical service to permit him also to have such other benefits as the association might provide, but without being compelled to pay his pro rata share for medical service.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. No; if he goes into the association at all, as I understand the proposal, he must pay his pro rata share of the medical association bill.

The only point that bothers me is that he does not have a free choice of doctors, but must accept the doctor chosen by the association, which in effect, as I said a moment ago, in my State is dominated by certain individuals or groups, and that, in my opinion, is not for the welfare of the farmer himself.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I do not quite follow the Senator's argument.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from South Dakota a question?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am perplexed, as is the Senator from Oregon, by the situation which we confront under the Senator's amendment. I have great sympathy with his objectives, but let me ask the Senator a question. If a farmer were to proceed with the liberty of choice which the Senator would undertake to give him, why would he not be better off not to join the association at all?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I think he would, but there is a certain amount of persuasion used in connection with the borrower by the Medical Association. It is not coercion; I do not mean to imply that; but here is a man borrowing money who is subject frequently to persuasion to do things which he would not like otherwise to do.

Mr. VANDENBERG. It seems to me that under the Senator's amendment the farmer who joins the association and then exercises his independent right of selection is simply penalized to the extent of his dues to the cooperative association.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. The Senator is quite right.

Mr. VANDENBERG. And that he would be infinitely better off to keep out of the association.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I agree with the Senator, and thank him for the contribution.

The point I am trying to make Mr. President, and I want to restate it for the sake of emphasis, is that the same amendment, not in the exact words but in purport, was adopted by the Senate last year in the former Congress, but was defeated by the action of the House. I am offering it again in substance because I believe that every farmer whether he is poor or rich is entitled to a free choice of a doctor for himself and his family. Under the committee amendment—and I am glad it has been placed in the bill so far as it goes—the choice is made by the associations or groups and not by the individual. Therefore, I ask to have inserted the words "members of the", meaning, of course, members of the associations. I am trying to give to each member the free choice of the doctor he wants.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from South Dakota to the committee amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I regret very much to be compelled to reiterate the statement I made a few moments ago, but the junior Senator from South Dakota has iterated and reiterated his statement, and since a number of Senators have come into the Chamber since I spoke I am compelled to repeat.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I do not understand why there should be a provision that the Farm Security Administration may assist farmers in the organization and administration of association in groups for medical care. Is there any law permitting that? There is an express prohibition under clause 4, on page 66, against the Farm Security Administration making loans to any cooperative association.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator will read clause 5 he will find that there is a specific exemption in the case of medical, dental, or hospital services.

Mr. TAFT. But that, as I understand, applies to the making of loans to individual members. Now, we come to this amendment which seems to imply that, besides making loans to individual farmers to enable them to pay their dues, the Farm Security Administration is author-

ized to make loans to organizations, associations, and groups for medical care. I have no objection to medical care to a health insurance plan if it is voluntarily formed, but I do not see why the Government should be promoting organizations for medical care. I do not know, but it seems to me that perhaps it would be well to strike out the whole committee amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am perfectly willing to strike out the entire committee amendment. The committee amendment was advanced, as I said, a moment ago, in an earnest, honest effort to meet the complaints of groups that claimed the medical doctors were the only ones who could get a contract with these associations. That is the only reason it was brought up.

I desire to correct one statement the Senator from South Dakota made. He said this amendment was adopted unanimously on a legislative bill. It was in a sense adopted unanimously. We had up a bill which was an amendment to a basic agricultural act. I had the bill in charge, and late in the afternoon, just before the recess, the Senator from South Dakota offered the amendment. I did not know anything about the merits of the case. The Senator said something about a free choice in hiring doctors. I believe in that.

So I accepted the amendment and it went into the bill but it was not discussed. When it went to conference with the House it was referred to the department. If the Senate wants to adopt the amendment which gives a member of an association who has the right to quit at any time he pleases and who cannot be compelled to join, the right to contract with any kind of doctor on behalf of the association, through association machinery, it will kill the association so far as other medical doctors are concerned, because they will not sign a contract along with others who practice other phases of the healing art.

The committee has gone rather far in the amendment. I do not think we ought to be asked to go further. We may have made a mistake in going as far as we did, and I am inclined to think we did. The amendment allows the people who want a contract with a chiropractor or an osteopath the right to make it. If we go any further than that, then we are going to deny medical aid to people who have been on this program which has been approved by the American Medical Association because regular doctors will not come in and sign contracts if they are compelled to sign along with a chiropractor. The Senator's amendment would give one person in the association who wants a chiropractor the power to deny to a hundred borrowers who want regular doctors the right to get the services of a regular doctor at the reduced charge which has been approved by the American Medical Association. That is what the Senate would do if it adopted the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. WHITE. I find myself very much confused by the language. As I read it, beginning in line 23, permission is given the association or group to have free

choice, and so forth. I take it that refers to an association or group as a unit.

Mr. RUSSELL. A wholly voluntary unit. I do not think the Senator from South Dakota can sustain his charge that people are coerced or impressed or conscripted into these associations. They are wholly voluntary.

Mr. WHITE. I was about to say that, as the language comes from the committee, a member of the association would be limited, or the association or the group would be limited, to those upon an approved list which had been prepared by the association or by the group. It seems to me that when we insert the words "members of the association or group," we are negating the right of the association or group to make up a list of accredited practitioners, and giving to every member of the group, every individual member of the association, a right to make his own selection.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. WHITE. It seems to me the amendment adds confusion to the situation.

Mr. RUSSELL. As I pointed out a moment ago, it would give one individual the right to destroy an association that was satisfactory to perhaps 800 or 1,000 other borrowers, because he happened to want a particular practitioner of a certain cult. An individual who may desire a faith healer should not insist upon destroying the rights of other members of an association to have a regular medical doctor if they wish to do so. He should retire from the association and get the faith healer as an individual or organize an association of his own.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am of the opinion that we should leave the wording as it was reported by the committee. As I understand, at the present time the Farm Security Administration does help organize these associations, and they are organized with an idea of having a particular group of doctors do the work. It was to get away from that particular thing that the amendment was inserted, so that at least the members of the association would have a free choice as to the doctors to be employed for the association, rather than the Farm Security Administration choosing the doctors for the associations.

I have heard the arguments made today, and I am of the opinion that the amendment offered by the able Senator from South Dakota will not work, that if we are to have associations, then we should allow the members as a group to choose their own doctors, and, as it is stated here, to have a free choice, and the Farm Security Administration not have the right to dictate to them that they must have John Doe or Richard Roe as the doctor for the group.

So I hope that we will at least allow this committee amendment to remain, for, if we do not, the Farm Security Administration will not be stopped from acting, and this cannot be an invitation for them to suggest a doctor, because they are already doing it.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, what possible right has the Farm Security Administration to tell a cooperative association, to which it lends no money, that it can employ one doctor or another? Why should we not prohibit that? What possible legal right has it to put any such compulsion on an association?

Mr. FERGUSON. Will the Senator from Georgia yield in order that I may answer?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I think it has absolutely no such right. The Farm Security Administration has been doing it illegally. It has been, in a way, coercion and intimidation of these people, but the Administration has been doing it, and at least this is an attempt to prevent that being done and to say to the members themselves, "You members have the free choice to pick your own doctor."

Mr. TAFT. But the words are "the Farm Security Administration shall permit the associations or groups to have free choice." Why have they any right to permit associations? They are free associations. They can do anything they want to do.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Ohio has been in the Senate long enough to know that amendments are usually drawn in the light of the representations made in the committee. Statements have been made that the Farm Security Administration would not allow these people to do what they wanted, so this amendment was drawn in an attempt to adjust the differences, and apply the bill to any group or association wanted by any group of borrowers from the Farm Security Administration. The wording is perhaps a little awkward.

Mr. TAFT. My suggestion is that it seems to me it does no harm, that it advises the Farm Security Administration, which attempts to assume some power over health associations which it has not, to organize people as against the ordinary method of employing their own doctors. I have no objection to health insurance associations, but I do not see why the Government should sponsor them.

Mr. RUSSELL. It is not health insurance associations. The reference is to medical aid associations.

Mr. TAFT. I take it to refer in substance to health insurance associations, such as an association one might join and pay a regular flat fee every year and get medical service from such doctors as the association chooses to furnish. I do not see why the Government should promote them as against private doctors. It seems to me that by inserting this language at all we sanction the whole procedure, and impose one little limitation, namely, that they have to employ a particular doctor.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, we are wasting a lot of time on nonessentials. We have made the best possible disposition of this question, after the fullest consideration. The Senator from Georgia has properly stated the case.

I wish to say to the Senator from Ohio that the whole theory of the Farm Security Administration is to provide a sort



of guardianship over and assistance to a low-income class of farmers. In the course of its work it can make grants without any consideration, or it can make loans, and in carrying on its work the Farm Security Administration does give a certain degree of supervision to this class of farmers, and advises them as to crops, how they shall plant, and what they shall do. As a part of that program there have been organized a considerable number of health groups. Most of this work is maintained by money which comes from the Farm Security Administration.

It was alleged that the Farm Security Administration employees, particularly in the counties, were taking advantage of the situation, and dictating too much to these health groups. So the committee amendment does exactly what the Senator from Ohio wants done, it takes any pressure from the Farm Security Administration off these health groups.

So far as the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota is concerned, it does not mean a thing. It merely would write in two words, and if we apply the interpretation given by the Senator from South Dakota to his own amendment, it makes it perfectly useless.

No man has to join a group or association. No one has to stay in one if he does not desire to. If he does belong to a group, he has to be governed by the group policy and principle. If he wants to hire his own doctor, he can do so whether he is a member of the group or is not, but he has to pay for him himself.

Mr. President, I do not believe that in a long time I have heard so many empty words and seen so much time wasted upon nothing as during the past 30 minutes.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I should like to add a few more words to the discussion.

There seems to be an idea that the Farm Security Administration is doing something wrong when it assists in organizing these medical associations, and that perhaps it should be prohibited from having any part in organizing them. As a matter of fact, these medical associations could not be organized at all if the Farm Security Administration did not assist in the work.

In the first place, when a man borrows from the Farm Security Administration, he does not put a sign on his barn saying "I have not any credit anywhere else, and I am borrowing from Farm Security." He does not send his name to the paper as a Farm Security borrower. There may not be another one in 5 or 10 miles from him. He has no way of knowing who the other borrowers from Farm Security are, and it is well their names are not published or made public in any way, because most of the borrowers are honest, and pay back their loans just as quickly as they can.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. When I finish the sentence I shall be glad to yield.

It seems to me we should not in any way object to the Farm Security Administration assisting in organizing these health associations, because otherwise there would be no organization or association, the doctors would not get the money they receive from these patients,

and the poor farmer borrowers would not be getting as good medical care, when they themselves or their families are sick as they now receive.

I now yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the Senator stated that there might be one man located at one place and there might not be another within 10 miles of him, who would be in need of the service provided by the association. How are a sufficient number of individuals gotten together, and closely enough together, under such circumstances, to form a health association? Is an individual doctor employed for each person? Does the association, for instance, employ an individual doctor for A, another doctor for B, who lives in the next county, and another doctor for C, who lives in still another county? Or must a considerable number of individuals be organized in one county to form an association and employ a doctor?

Mr. AIKEN. All I know is how this plan has operated in my State, where it is operated on a State-wide basis. So far as I know, each member of the association calls his own family doctor whenever he is sick. That is evidently done under an arrangement between the doctors of the State and the medical association which has been organized by the Farm Security Administration. I do not know what the dues are now. A few years ago members were loaned \$20 a year which they would invest in medical insurance. If that amount were not sufficient to pay the doctors for their services, then as I understand they prorated the loss according to the number of calls which were made and the charges which were made for the calls.

A few years ago the amount loaned was \$20. The amount may be more now. That amount, whatever it was, very likely was just so much more than the doctor would have received from many of the families if the association had not existed. I know the doctors seem to approve the plan, and cooperate with the Farm Security Administration in working it out. It seems to be operating very happily. I should hate to see anything done to disturb it. I agree with the Senator from Ohio, however, that probably the whole amendment is completely unnecessary and probably inadvisable.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] to the committee amendment on page 66, line 23.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 66, beginning in line 20.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I suggest that the committee amendment be rejected. I really do not think it adds anything useful. Surely the Farm Security Administration cannot dictate to the medical associations, and I really think it would be far better, and would obviate controversy if we were simply to eliminate the amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have stated my position on this matter here-

tofore. I do not think the Senator from Ohio was on the floor when I did so. The amendment was offered merely as an effort to compose these differences. I am not wedded to the amendment, and I will not care one whit if it is voted down.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 66 beginning in line 20. [Putting the question.] The Chair is in doubt and will call for a rising vote.

On a division the committee amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Farm tenancy," on page 68, line 8, after the word "act", to strike out "\$2,000,000" and insert "\$2,500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 68, line 13, before the word "including", to strike out "\$40,000,000" and insert "\$50,000,000"; and in line 20, after the words "per annum", to insert "and which sum shall not be used for making loans under the terms of said act for the purchase of farms of greater value than the average efficient farm management unit, as determined by the Secretary, in the county, parish, or locality in which such purchase may be made."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Water conservation and utilization projects," on page 70, line 19, after the word "periodicals", to insert a semicolon and "construction and alteration of farm and other buildings and roads for the use of project occupants on any lands within the boundaries of water conservation and utilization projects in said area."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Rural Electrification Administration", on page 71, line 12, after the word "reports", to strike out "\$3,150,000" and insert "\$3,330,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 71, line 15, after the word "thereof", to strike out "\$60,000,000" and insert "\$125,000,000, and, of which sum, \$35,000,000 shall be immediately available as an additional amount for the fiscal year 1945 for these purposes."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That completes the committee amendments. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I do not wish to offer an amendment, but I desire to comment on the provision found on page 55 which appropriates \$50,000,000 Federal aid to provide school lunches. That appropriation is made in an appropriation bill without any legislation having been enacted to authorize it. Such legislation is pending, but there is no authorization for this appropriation. That is not a reason for making an objection under the rules, because the item was placed in the bill in the House. But I want to call attention to the fact again that the advocates of the school-lunch program have repeatedly promised that they would bring forward a bill to outline the exact conditions of the Federal

aid. The \$50,000,000 is for school aid. As it stands, I believe it violates nearly every principle of Federal aid for State and local communities. The States have no control whatever over it. The appropriation is made directly to individual school districts of all kinds throughout the United States. It seems to me that the Federal interest in school lunches is remote. The aid goes to children whether they need it or not. It goes to children of millionaires as well as to children of the poor. It has no direct relation to need.

Of course, the program as originally started was, as I think, a clear usurpation of authority by the Commodity Credit Corporation. It was begun by the distribution of surplus food to the schools for school lunches, and then, when there was no longer any surplus food, they commuted the aid in dollars. I think there is not the slightest authority for it, although the Congress has for several years confirmed the distribution. I do not want to stop it at the moment. But I think that, certainly, before it comes up again next year, we should enact a law; we should determine whether we want to make the principle permanent. If so, we should base it on sound principles of grants through the States, and require some kind of matching by the States in order that they should provide proper school lunches. I hope very much that there will be such legislation before the next year's appropriation is made.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, there has been legislation for the last 2 years requiring matching.

The Senator will find at the bottom of page 57, in line 18, the provision:

The amount of funds available hereunder for a school-lunch program used in any State, Territory, possession, or the District of Columbia during any fiscal year shall not exceed the total amount otherwise furnished for the same purpose by or on behalf of the school authorities and other sponsoring agencies in such State, Territory, possession, or District of Columbia.

I do not want to get into a discussion of the matter, Mr. President, unless there is opposition to the continuance of the program.

Mr. TAFT. I think the Senator agrees, however, that there should be permanent authorization.

Mr. RUSSELL. I simply wish to say that I do not want to debate with the Senator the necessity of having clear legislation on this subject if we are to follow this program further. I am one of those who think the program should be continued, but it should be continued under a basic statutory act. We are now working in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry on what we hope will be a satisfactory bill which will enable us to have the necessary standards and yardsticks. However, I may say that this matter of school lunches has not been handled in quite as haphazard fashion as the Senator from Ohio has indicated, because on two or three occasions the committee has offered amendments to the bill which required matching and established other limitations. We limit the amount of funds which can be spent by the Federal Government to not a greater

sum than the cost of the agricultural commodities which go into the food. There are a number of other safeguards and limitations which have been placed around this program by the Committee on Appropriations. That of course does not obviate the necessity and desirability for having basic legislation.

Mr. President, I share the hope of the Senator from Ohio that there may be enacted into a law a bill which will clarify and make permanent this program.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, during the Seventy-eighth Congress the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry held extensive hearings on a bill introduced by myself and the late Senator Smith, of South Carolina, and also a bill introduced by the distinguished Senator from Georgia, providing for a permanent school-lunch program. This year similar bills were introduced. I am glad to state that last week, in a conference held in my office between those interested on behalf of the Department of Agriculture and those interested on behalf of the Office of Education, we practically concluded what should be in the bill. Within the next 2 weeks, at the latest, we propose to have before the Senate a bill providing for a permanent school-lunch program.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I merely wish to refresh the Senator's memory as to the diligent effort made to obtain basic legislation during the last session. When the Pace bill came over from the House, containing authorization for numerous activities which had been carried on without authorization, the Senate committee on Agriculture and Forestry, of which the Senator from Georgia, the Senator from Louisiana, and I are members, incorporated in that bill a section providing basic authority for the school-lunch program. The bill was reported to the Senate and passed by the Senate. It went to conference, and the conferees of the House refused to accept it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the Senator is correct, as he usually is. However, he should have added that by an amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio the program was limited to a 2-year period.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is true.

Mr. RUSSELL. However, even on that basis the House refused to accept it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is before the Senate and open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill H. R. 2689 was read the third time and passed.

Mr. RUSSELL. I move that the Senate insist on its amendments, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr.

BANKHEAD, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. REED, and Mr. CAPPER conferees on the part of the Senate.

#### FURTHER PROSECUTION OF THE WAR— PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The President pro tempore laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 43) which was read, as follows:

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed 201,000 additional copies of House Document No. 143, current session, entitled "Further Prosecution of the War," an address of the President of the United States, of which 150,000 copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives, 50,000 copies for the use of the Senate, and 1,000 copies for the Senate document room.*

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House concurrent resolution. It provides for the printing of additional copies of House Document No. 143, entitled "Further Prosecution of the War," an address by the President of the United States. This was the address delivered last Monday by President Truman.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Does it contain the usual provision that a certain number of copies be printed for the benefit of the House and a certain number for the Senate?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. What is the basis of apportionment?

Mr. HAYDEN. It is usually based upon the membership of the respective Houses. A larger number is required by the House because of its larger membership.

Mr. WHITE. Does the resolution provide for the apportionment?

Mr. HAYDEN. The resolution provides that 150,000 copies shall be available for the use of the House of Representatives, and 50,000 copies for the use of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 43) was agreed to.

#### THE THIRTY-FOURTH DIVISION—ARTICLE FROM MINNEAPOLIS MORNING TRIBUNE

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the clerk read the four paragraphs of a news item published in the Minneapolis Morning Tribune for April 6, 1945.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the article will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

#### VETERAN THIRTY-FOURTH DIVISION ARMY'S MOST DECORATED

(By Nat Finney)

WASHINGTON.—The Thirty-fourth Division, mustered into service at Minnesota, Iowa, and North and South Dakota National Guard armories in January 1941, now is recognized as the Army's most decorated and veteran outfit. Its record was made public in Italy Thursday.

It has more combat days, nearly 500, to its credit than any other division in the United States Army. Even if it doesn't see another



battle in this war it will go home with a record equaled by no other division.

Men of the Thirty-fourth, who wear the divisional "red bull" emblem, have won 15,000 Purple Hearts, 9 Congressional Medals of Honor, 93 Distinguished Service Crosses, 116 Legion of Merit Medals, 1,052 Silver Stars, 51 Soldier's Medals, 1,713 Bronze Stars, 3 Presidential citations, 7 British awards, 7 French awards, 6 Italian awards, 1 Distinguished Service Medal, 1 Distinguished Flying Cross, 34 Air Medals with 52 Oak Leaf Clusters, 525 divisional citations, 6 War Department meritorious service unit plaques, and 15 Army commendations of the unit.

The division has had 38 months overseas duty. The 21,731 awards received by the Thirty-fourth were accumulated at Algiers, Tunisia, Salerno, Cassino, Anzio, and in northern Italy, where it continues to fight the Germans.

#### EXTENSION OF SMALLER WAR PLANTS CORPORATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAYBANK in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 105) to extend the life of the Smaller War Plants Corporation, which was, after line 10, to insert:

Sec. 2. (a) Section 4 (c) of such Public Law 603 is amended to read as follows:

"(c) The management of the Corporation shall be vested in a board of five directors, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from among individuals who are familiar with the problems of small business. The President shall designate one of the members as Chairman."

(b) Notwithstanding the amendment made by subsection (a) of this section, the members of the Board of Directors of the Smaller War Plants Corporation holding office at the time of the enactment of this act shall continue in office until five members have been appointed pursuant to section 4 (c) of such Public Law 603 as amended by this section.

Mr. WAGNER. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

#### FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McKELLAR submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2374) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1945, and June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 40 and 44.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 18, 22, 23, 25, 26, 30, 31, 32, 39, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 54, 55, 56, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, and 70, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$6,700,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amend-

ment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$30,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 53: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 53, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: "and no greater sum shall be available except in pursuance of a direct appropriation"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 57: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 57, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"Flood control, general: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1945, for 'Flood control, general', including the objects specified under this head in the War Department Civil Appropriation Act, 1945, to be available until expended, \$1,000,000: *Provided*, That this sum shall be immediately available for obligation and expenditure for necessary plans, specifications, and preliminary work in connection with projects for post-war construction authorized by the Flood Control Act approved December 22, 1944"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 16, 19, 20, 21, 24, 27, 28, 29, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 42, 43, 45, 46, and 47.

KENNETH McKELLAR,  
CARL HAYDEN,  
MILLARD E. TYDINGS,  
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,  
CHAN GURNEY,  
HAROLD H. BURTON,  
JOSEPH H. BALL,

*Managers on the part of the Senate.*

CLARENCE CANNON,  
C. A. WOODRUM,  
LOUIS LUDLOW,  
J. BUELL SNYDER,  
EMMET O'NEAL,  
LOUIS C. RABAUT,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I wish to ask the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee to clarify for the RECORD, if he will, the conclusions of the conferees and their action in reducing from \$2,000,000 to \$1,000,000 the amount appropriated for the Army engineers in the deficiency appropriation bill. I should like to ask the Senator if the \$1,000,000 agreed to by the conferees is available for the Missouri Basin project and the Central Valley project, as well as the projects which were the basis of the \$1,000,000 Budget estimate to the Congress in Senate Document No. 10.

Mr. McKELLAR. The answer is "Yes." The conferees intended to include the Central Valley, as well as the Missouri Valley.

Mr. GURNEY. With that answer, Mr. President, I am thoroughly in accord with the conference report, and hope it will be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, in order that the RECORD may afford a clear understanding of the action of the conferees, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from

General Robins, Acting Chief of Engineers, dated April 19, 1945, which has to do with the conference report on House bill 2374.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### WAR DEPARTMENT.

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,  
Washington, April 19, 1945.

Hon. CHAN GURNEY,

United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR GURNEY: In accordance with your verbal request, the following information is furnished regarding the status of the supplemental estimate for the fiscal year 1945 for funds for the preparation of plans for projects in the Missouri River Basin authorized by the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944.

The Department submitted to the Bureau of the Budget on January 5, 1945, a supplemental estimate in the amount of \$2,000,000 for the fiscal year 1945 for the preparation of plans for projects authorized in the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944. The tentative allocations of funds inclosed with that estimate are as follows:

	Proposed allocations
Tyrone, Pa., local protection.....	\$75,000
Harrisburg, Pa., local protection....	60,000
Buggs Island Reservoir, Roanoke River Basin, Va. and N. C.....	100,000
Clark Hill Reservoir, Savannah River, Ga. and S. C.....	100,000
Shreveport, Red River, La., local protection.....	75,000
Arkansas River local protection projects.....	275,000
Trinidad, Purgatoire River, Colo.....	50,000
Garrison Reservoir, Missouri River Basin, N. Dak.....	200,000
Oahe Reservoir, Missouri River Basin, S. Dak. and N. Dak.....	200,000
Missouri River, local protection projects.....	150,000
Mount Morris Reservoir, Genesee River, N. Y.....	100,000
Alamo Reservoir, Bill Williams River, Ariz.....	75,000
Holbrook, Little Colorado River, Ariz., local protection.....	15,000
Table Mountain Reservoir, Sacramento River Basin, Calif.....	100,000
Isabella Reservoir, San Joaquin River Basin, Calif.....	75,000
Kings River project, Pine Flat Reservoir and channel improvement, San Joaquin River Basin, Calif.....	100,000
Terminus Reservoir, Kaweah River, Calif.....	75,000
Farmington Reservoir, Littlejohn Creek, Calif.....	75,000
Merced County project, San Joaquin.....	50,000
Redmond, Sevier River, Utah, local protection.....	25,000
Pajaro River, Calif., local protection.....	25,000
Total.....	2,000,000

The Bureau of the Budget on February 26, 1945, forwarded a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1945 in the amount of \$1,000,000 for the preparation of plans for projects authorized in the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944, which was transmitted to the Congress by the President on February 28, 1945, and printed in Senate Document No. 10, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session. In a letter dated February 26, 1945, the Bureau of the Budget also notified this Department of its action in submitting the supplemental estimate printed in Senate Document No. 10 and advised the Department that Executive office approval was granted for the preparation of plans for projects shown in a tabulation accompanying

that letter. That list includes the projects contained in the supplemental estimate as submitted to the Bureau of the Budget by the Department on January 5, 1945, with the exception of the following projects:

	<i>Proposed allocations</i>
Missouri Valley:	
Garrison Reservoir, Missouri River Basin, N. Dak.	\$200,000
Osage Reservoir, Missouri River Basin, S. Dak. and N. Dak.	200,000
Missouri River, local protection projects.	150,000
Subtotal.	550,000
Central Valley, Calif.:	
Table Mountain Reservoir, Sacramento River Basin, Calif.	100,000
Isabella Reservoir, San Joaquin River Basin, Calif.	75,000
Kings River project, California.	100,000
Terminus Reservoir, Kaweah River, Calif.	75,000
Farmington Reservoir, Littlejohn Creek, Calif.	75,000
Subtotal.	425,000
Total.	975,000

In view of the foregoing, it appears that the Bureau of the Budget can disapprove the allotment of funds from the appropriation of \$1,000,000 contained in the First Deficiency Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1945 as reported by the conference committees on April 17, 1945, for the preparation of plans in that fiscal year for projects in the Missouri River Basin and the Central Valley of California as authorized in the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS M. ROBINS,  
Major General,  
Acting Chief of Engineers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 2374, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,

April 18, 1945.

*Resolved*, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 21, 27, 28, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 45, 46, and 47 to the bill (H. R. 2374) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1945, and June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, and concur therein;

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum of \$343,340 named in said amendment insert "\$225,000";

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum of \$50,000 named in said amendment insert "\$25,000";

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the last proviso in said amendment insert: "Provided further, That, unless otherwise expressly provided by law, no funds of any Government corporation shall be used to pay the cost of any private audit of the financial records of the offices of such corporation except the cost of such audits contracted for and undertaken prior to the date of approval of this act";

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: "Provided, That all obligations of this additional appropriation for projects in which (1) the War Department has a paramount interest, shall first be jointly authorized in writing by the Secretary of War and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, (2) the Navy Department has a paramount interest, shall first be jointly authorized in writing by the Secretary of the Navy and the Directors of the Bureau of the Budget: *Provided further*, That \$18,373,000 of such sum of \$84,373,000 shall not be obligated unless subsequently authorized by other law";

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert:

"UNITED STATES HIGH COMMISSIONER TO THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

"Salaries and expenses: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1945, for the maintenance of the office of the United States High Commissioner to the Philippine Islands, including the objects specified under this head in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1945, and including the employment without regard to civil-service and classification laws of technical employees who may be engaged for the purpose of making an economic survey of conditions in the Philippine Islands, \$60,000";

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum of \$200,000 named in said amendment insert "\$100,000"; and

That the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16 to said bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 19, 20, 24, 29, 42, and 43. The motion was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. I now move that the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 16.

The motion was agreed to.

#### TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McKELLAR submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2252) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 7 and 10.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 20, 21, and 25 and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$36,650"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amend-

ment insert "\$710,800"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$553,250"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$879,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$454,740"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$120,600"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$291,800"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$405,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$3,073,375"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$956,250"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$960,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,  
PAT MCCARRAN,  
J. W. BAILEY,  
WALLACE H. WHITE, Jr.,  
CHAN GURNEY,  
CLYDE M. REED,

*Managers on the part of the Senate.*

LOUIS LUDLOW,  
EMMET O'NEAL,  
THOMAS D'ALESSANDRO, Jr.,  
HERMAN P. KOPPELMANN,  
JOHN TABER,  
FRANK B. KEEFE,  
HARVE TIBBETT,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

The report was agreed to.

#### LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have been assigned as chairman of a subcommittee which would like to take testimony this afternoon. There are some witnesses here from long distances. So I ask unanimous consent that, if I am taken away from Capitol Hill in order



to obtain some of the evidence, I be excused with the permission of every Member of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska? The Chair hears none, and permission is granted.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be excused for the remainder of the day.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, consent of the Senate is granted.

#### EXTENSION OF SELECTIVE TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT OF 1940

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2625) to extend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] on behalf of himself, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON].

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, on October 23, 1942, when the extension of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 was being considered, I introduced a substitute amendment, which provided for 12 months' training of inductees under 20 years of age before they were placed in actual combat duty beyond the territorial boundaries of continental United States. The amendment was adopted by a yea-and-nay vote in the Senate, but was later stricken from the bill by the joint Senate and House conference committee.

I now offer for later consideration the same amendment as a substitute for the pending amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] and other Senators to House bill 2625.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment in the form of a substitute will be received and will be read.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, the Senator from Texas has not requested immediate consideration of his substitute amendment, has he?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. No; the Senator from Texas has asked that it be pending.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following:

No person under 20 years of age, inducted under this act, shall be placed in actual combat duty beyond the territorial boundaries of continental United States, until after he has had at least 1 year's military training, following his induction.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Chair please state the present parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The pending business before the Senate is the bill to extend the Selective Training and Service Act. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Texas as a substitute for the amendment proposed by the Senator from Tennessee and other Senators.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I wish to discuss the amendment proposed by

the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], and myself. The amendment was printed and laid on the table on the 16th day of March, the last legislative day, and actually on the calendar day of April 5. It was called up yesterday near the conclusion of the session of the Senate. It has been read by the clerk. It is offered as an amendment to House bill 2625, a bill which would extend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended. As I understand, that act expires on May 15.

The cosponsors of the amendment thought it might better be offered as an amendment to the bill which would extend the Selective Training and Service Act, rather than to undertake to secure the passage of the amendment as a separate bill. The amendment provides the following:

SEC. —. Section 3 (a) of such act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and the following: "And provided further, That no man under 19 years of age who is inducted into the land or naval forces under the provisions of this act shall be ordered into actual combat service until after he has been given at least 6 months of military training."

The amendment in the nature of a substitute which has been sent to the desk by the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] is substantially the same as the amendment I have just read, except I believe the substitute provides that each inductee must have a year's training before he can be placed in combat service outside continental United States.

The amendment we have offered provides for a period of 6 months' training, which may take place in this country or in Europe or in any other part of the world where the armed forces might see proper to give training to the inductee. In other words, the amendment would not prevent the removal from this country of young men inducted under the Selective Training and Service Act, but it would prevent any young man who is drafted after having reached 18 years of age, of course, from being actually placed in combat service until he has received as much as 6 months' training. The amendment is presented for the reason that it is felt by my colleagues and me that particularly on account of the tender years of a boy of 18, he should be given, insofar as possible, a period of seasoning before he enters actual combat.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I am in complete accord with the Senator's amendment. I submitted an amendment to the committee providing that boys should not be put into active combat service before being given a year's training. When General Marshall testified before the Military Affairs Committee at the time the fathers' draft bill was before that committee, my recollection of the testimony is that the Army officials wanted to give the boys a year's training before putting them into combat service.

I, as well as perhaps every other Senator, have received letters from mothers and fathers stating that their boys had been shipped overseas and put into combat service after having had only 6 weeks of training. Some had not had any training whatever. The other day I received a letter from a lady who said that her boy had never had a gun in his hands and had received no training at all when he was put into combat service. He was wounded on the first day of his active service. That seems to be a very cruel procedure. I can see no reason why every boy should not now be given at least 6 months of training before he is put into active combat service.

Mr. STEWART. I thank the Senator from Montana. Does he not base his judgment upon the fact that ordinarily a boy only 18 years of age is too young to be pressed into active service without first being given a period of seasoning, which would not only equip him and prepare him physically, but would give him a much-needed mental status? Many of the boys who are inducted into the service at 18 years of age have never been any great distance away from their homes. Some of them may have been away at boarding school for a year or two, but many of them have been only a few miles away from their homes. In other words, they are being taken—to us the well-known expression—away from their mothers' apron strings. They have not become experienced even in the ordinary affairs of life, much less in the ways of engaging in this horrible war which is daily taking its toll of lives. It has been said that many of these boys have been placed side by side with veteran troops, and that they do not need much training. However, I think there is a human side to the situation as well as a practical one. Does not the Senator from Montana think I am correct in my views?

Mr. WHEELER. I certainly do think the Senator from Tennessee is correct. Some boys at 18 years of age are well matured; but I venture to say that the vast majority of them are in exactly the status which the Senator from Tennessee has described. When boys have been shipped overseas and put into active combat service, after having received training for only 2 weeks, as has been the case with many inductees, and are injured or killed within the first day or two, the result is much bitterness on the part of the parents. They feel that the boys had not been given the proper training before being sent overseas.

Mr. STEWART. I do not wish to put myself in the attitude of undertaking to prophesy when the war will end, because a great deal of bad guessing has already been done with regard to that question; but it seems to me that we have reached a stage in the war when we can do without the military service of many of the boys of this country who are only 18 years of age.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. I ask the Senator from Tennessee whether he believes that the words in the amendment, "given at least 6 months of military training" are sufficient to define what he means. The

Senator from Montana stated that some boys had been sent into military service without ever having had a gun in their hands before they were drafted. I recently received a letter from a prominent citizen of New Jersey who evidenced, though in a patriotic way, resentment at the fact that his boy, who was 18 years of age, had been drafted into service, held in this country for 6 months, given no training with guns at all, and sent across into the field of battle. He lost his life on the firing line within 5 weeks after leaving America.

The Senator from Tennessee is trying to do a very worthy thing, but I wish to ask him whether the words "6 months of military training" mean what he intends them to mean? Let us see if we cannot provide that the boy will actually be given the kind of military training that will equip him to become a soldier by the time he reaches the battlefield. I make that statement merely as a suggestion, because the amendment is not mine; it is the Senator's. However, I personally do not feel that the mere words "6 months of military training" cover the situation which the Senator has in mind.

Mr. STEWART. Of course, it is intended that the boy shall be trained in the branch of the service in which the Army intends to use him.

Mr. HAWKES. Will the Senator further yield to me?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. That is exactly what the Senator and I have in mind. I believe it is also what other Senators have in mind. The point which the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] has made—and I have heard it made many times—is that the boys are inducted under the Selective Service Act. Six months pass and they have not received the necessary training. Yet they are sent abroad and put on the firing line. Many of them lose their lives very soon after entering active combat. The result is bitterness and dissatisfaction on the part of the parents at home.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. On the basis of the information which was given us by officials of the War Department, as well as official records of casualties, I believe we will agree that casualties are always higher among soldiers who have not received sufficient training. The War Department undertakes to justify its present conduct on the basis of its announced policy, namely, to keep the pressure on the enemy. The War Department officials have asserted that they had to use thousands of young men. I assert that the casualties among the youngsters who had not been given a sufficient period of training have been higher than among soldiers who had been given a long period of training, and were well trained.

I think we would do well to look at the history of the situation insofar as the American people are concerned. I have before me a copy of former Secretary of War Baker's report on the war in 1917 and 1918. The report was prepared by Col. Leonard P. Ayres. A letter of transmittal was sent to the War Department

in 1918 by Newton D. Baker. In the last war it was the policy to give the average American soldier who went to France 6 months' training in this country before he sailed. Then they undertook to give him 2 months in a quiet sector after that, and then 1 month before sending him into an active sector and taking part in hard fighting. I do not say that many men did not go in before that time had elapsed, but of the 1,400,000 men who actually fought in France in the last war the average American soldier in France had 6 months' training here, 2 months overseas before, and 1 month in a quiet sector before he went into the battle line.

I think the records will show that in this war a division like the One Hundred and Sixth Division, that got into the Belgian bulge in a so-called quiet sector, was almost completely wiped out after it had been in that sector only a few days.

Of course, that was one of the great tragedies of war. That was something that could not have been foreseen by the Army. It might have been their intention to keep that division in a quiet sector; they thought it would be a quiet sector, but it was suddenly changed into a violent and active sector.

It seems to me our situation now is such that we are in a position to say definitely that there should not be any needless sacrifice of our young men, and they should not be sent into the battle line before they have had at least 6 months' training. That may not be enough, and, of course, I am sure the War Department would like to give them more training than that; but, on the theory that we have to keep pressure on the enemy—that is the way they justify it; and they have kept pressure on the enemy—by keeping it on the enemy we may win the war sooner; and while the losses may be greater than they otherwise would be, yet on the whole they may be less than they would be if this policy had not been adopted.

I do not want to be critical of what the Army has done. They justify it on the theory that they had to keep pressure on the enemy when they thought they saw signs of his weakness in order to gain time and perhaps save thousands of lives. It looks as if now the situation is not so urgent to keep pressure on the enemy; that we could not at least suggest that the Army take a little more time to train the men.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I have been very anxious constantly not to do anything or say anything that would conflict with the handling of the war by the men we have so wisely placed in charge of our war effort. I believe we have been greatly benefited by the leadership of the admirals and the generals of the Navy and Army. But I think there is no subject that has hurt so much or dug deeper into the hearts of the American people than the thought that their sons 18 years old, the youngest men who are called into the service, may be hurled into the tragic experience of front-line service without being prepared adequately so that they may be given a chance at least to defend their own lives as they fight for their country.

I believe we have reached that stage in the war when we, as the Congress, might very well say we believe that it is best for the war effort to assure the mothers and fathers of America that henceforward none of their boys 18 years of age will be hurled into the jaws of this tragic war, facing death in the front line, unless he has had at least 6 months' preparation so that he may adequately defend himself by being trained to shoot and to handle whatever intricate weapons may be placed in his hands. I intend to support the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. STEWART. I thank the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The able Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] just gave an interesting example of an episode of the sort which troubles me in connection with the amendment submitted by the Senator from Tennessee. He told about the One Hundred and Sixth Division which was supposed to be and planned to be in a training area, but it was suddenly reached by the German bulge and had become a combat division.

What would happen if there were imposed a hard-and-fast restriction of this sort under such circumstances? Does not the Senator feel that there should be some recognition that there may be an extraordinary emergency in which it would be impossible to apply his rule? Would we not achieve our purposes if we adopted his amendment and made it read "except in extraordinary emergencies, no man under 19," and so forth? In that event if the war should develop a crisis which we do not foresee, in which circumstances the Senator would not wish to have our ability to defend ourselves crippled, we would not create a situation which might leave the Army impotent, as might happen if we provide an utterly hard-and-fast rule which admits of no emergencies whatever. I submit that to the Senator. I should like to support his amendment with some such escape clause in the case of extraordinary emergencies.

Mr. STEWART. I thank the Senator. I appreciate his contribution, which is an excellent one.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STEWART. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, the One Hundred and Sixth Division has been mentioned in this debate as it has been mentioned before. It so happens that the One Hundred and Sixth Division was activated in Columbia, S. C., and it so happens that the One Hundred and Sixth Division was composed principally of troops from South Carolina, Indiana, and Illinois, and it moved out to Indiana for further training. On many occasions I have heard the statement about the One Hundred and Sixth Division being composed of green troops. I know many men in the One Hundred and Sixth Division; I know the commanding officer and many of those who lost their lives and many of those who



are now in hospitals in France. I receive letters from them occasionally.

I want to reiterate what I said on the Senate floor that the One Hundred and Sixth Division was trained for more than a year, indeed, as I recall, for 19 months. They were trained troops and the men themselves resent the statements published in the newspapers that they were untrained. The One Hundred and Sixth put up a great battle, and did a most heroic job for the United States; none did better.

I mention that in connection with the amendment, because I know, as I have said, many members of the One Hundred and Sixth Division. I know the commanding general and a good many officers on his staff. They represent the best America has.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. I did not hear all the statement of the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. The distinguished Senator from Michigan followed the statement made by the Senator from Kentucky, and again referred to the One Hundred and Sixth Division, and I wanted on the Senate floor to pay them a great compliment. I went on to say that I believe they were trained for more than a year, indeed for 19 months, and they did a most heroic job on the battle line. That was the statement made by me.

Mr. CHANDLER. I am certain that is true; but it was not intended at the time they got into battle that they should be in it. What I said was that they were in a quiet sector. I do not know how long they were trained or whether they were trained as a division for a sufficient time, but I do know that they were placed in what was considered to be a quiet sector, which suddenly turned into a violent sector, which the battle reached very quickly. The information I received was that when they put them in that quiet sector they had not considered that they were put in the battle line, but suddenly the Germans made it a battle line and battleground, and, of course, they fought valiantly, as every American does when someone tackles him. There is no showing in this war that any American man or any American boy turned his back on the enemy; they fought very bravely, but they were literally cut all to pieces.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield, if I am permitted to.

Mr. MAYBANK. I merely wish to say to the Senator from Kentucky that that in substance is what I said as to their bravery, and as to the wonderful work they did, but I did say they had been trained, if my memory serves me correctly, for some 19 months; I know it was longer than a year.

Mr. CHANDLER. Of course, what I said had no application to one who had been trained adequately and with his division, and for a full training period, but I have the feeling, indeed, it is something more than a feeling, it is knowledge, that

thousands of American boys have died in this war, young boys, who had not had sufficient training, who might not have died if they had had sufficient training. I do not wish to blame anyone for that, but I think it is true. They might not have been able to save their lives if they had had all the combat training that could have been given, but the record shows a soldier has a better chance to live if he has sufficient training.

The War Department undertook to justify their use of 18-year-olds when not sufficient training had been given, though I do not want to say insufficient training, because it has come to the point where they think they can speed up training so that a little is sufficient. I have some doubt about that. But they had not time to give the training which should be given to a soldier so that we could say he was fully trained and equipped, able to take his part in the combat of modern war. The Secretary of War and the Chief of Staff justify their policy by saying that the reason for it was to keep the pressure on the enemy.

If that is the reason, and if it was justified, and if it brought about just as good results or better results, I do not know anyone who can really object, but it is my belief that everything that is humanly possible to be done from the standpoint of training an American soldier should be done, because if he is trained he has a better chance to live than if he is not sufficiently and adequately trained. I do not think anyone will doubt that statement.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Agreeing with everything the Senator from Kentucky says, let me ask him whether in the final analysis, if Congress is going to assert this doctrine again—and I think it should—should there not be a provision permitting the Army in extraordinary emergency to meet the extraordinary emergency with whatever the extraordinary emergency requires?

Mr. CHANDLER. I should have to say yes, and even if we passed a law, and I was the commander, and I had soldiers, in an extraordinary emergency I would have to use them even if they had hoes and rakes and pitchforks, and had not intended to fight at all. We have to leave the commanders some leeway. If we do not, they will take it. I think there is no question that we have to do the best we can to justify in the hearts and minds of the American people the feeling that the Senate of the United States is conscious of the problem, and that we are just as anxious as we can be not to create a situation that will send an 18-year-old son of an American mother and father into combat without sufficient training. Their hearts are going to be broken anyway, and if we do nothing else than give them some reassurance that we are trying to do the best we can in urging our military men to give the utmost consideration to this matter, we will have done a good job.

Mr. TAFT and Mr. MAYBANK addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. STEWART. I yield first to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. With regard to the emergency question, the law says that no boy shall be inducted until he is 18 years old. I see no reason at all why we should not say that no boy shall go overseas until he is 18 years and 6 months old. As I understand, that was said in England for many years. I do not know whether they have since modified it. Of course, if there is a regiment just behind the lines composed of replacements, and the whole division is called into action, probably there would be some necessity to send everybody in the division forward, but my feeling has been that a captain in the front line would far rather have 80 men who are trained than a hundred men of whom 20 are green recruits, who come to his company the very day they go into battle.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator from Ohio probably understands that military commanders try to fight a division for a reasonable time, and then take it out of line and rest it, and send in a new division. They stopped doing that, because they said they had to keep the pressure on the enemy, so that when a division had losses, they infiltrated some new soldiers in, probably young fellows who had not had a sufficient amount of training. I am just trying not to be too critical, because I know the Department justifies its practice, but in an emergency, as the Senator from Michigan has said, if a division commander in a sector has losses, and has men available of the category described by the Senator from Ohio, it is inconceivable to me that he would not have to use every one available. We could not pass any law which would keep him from doing it. I am going to be realistic about this and say that if he had to be realistic, he would throw them into battle to try to save the situation.

Mr. TAFT. That might be true of a whole unit, but I still maintain the great bulk of the men sent from this country during January, February, and March, were sent after 17 weeks' training, or 15 weeks, and as soon as they reached the French ports they were sent immediately to the front lines. The Senator is familiar with the fact that a few months ago I made a speech in the Senate on this subject, and I received probably 3,000 letters about it. There was no doubt then that that was not an extraordinary practice, it was the regular practice. Every man 18 years of age who was duly inducted was given 17 weeks training. They sailed from this country 4 or 5 months after they had been inducted, and as soon as they reached France, they were sent to the front line, without any training in France. That is a thing which I think is wholly unnecessary. I do not think that those men arriving at the front in the middle of a battle did their particular company any good.

The trained veterans were far better able to fight, and that is the opinion of many Army officers. There is, however, a school in the War Department that has felt that every unit must be filled up re-

ardless of how it is filled. It seems to me that Congress is perfectly competent to say that that shall not hereafter be done. After all, we have 9,000,000 men in the Army of the United States, and we have not over a million men today on the front in France. Certainly the Department can find, somewhere, among the other 8,000,000, soldiers to take the places of the men who are no longer fit for combat, instead of taking those not adequately trained.

Mr. CHANDLER. That may be one of the fruits of not being ready, and that may be one of the penalties the American people must pay and one of the burdens they must carry. But we must remember that our British allies and French allies and others on the western front were wholly incapable of putting sufficient manpower or a considerable percentage of manpower into the fight, and we had to carry the tremendous and overwhelming burden of the fight. On the theory that we were the only ones who had available sufficient manpower to keep the pressure on the enemy to prevent losing the battle, I am not going to say that under the circumstances it perhaps was not the only thing the military authorities could have done, because we could not call on the British to furnish the soldiers. They either did not have them, or they were not there. We could not call on the French to do it. They either did not have them, or they were not there. I am not at liberty to say how many divisions we had on that front, but some day, when Senators learn the story, they may be amazed at the magnificent part in men and material and equipment the people of the United States contributed to that fight. Certainly it is a long way from "Give us the tools and we will finish the fight."

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I have followed with interest the statement of the able Senator from Kentucky that one reason for sending in the American troops quickly was that the manpower could not be found, soldiers could not be found, from the countries of our allies.

Let me point out to the Senator that at that very time, under the laws of Britain no boy was permitted to leave the British Isles until he was 18 years and 6 months old. Let me further point out that in Canada, during that very time, no boy was permitted to go abroad until he was 19 years old, and until December last, no Canadian boy went abroad to fight on the fields of battle unless he volunteered.

Mr. CHANDLER. I did not say it could not be done. I merely said they were not fighting. Of course, if we had done what the Senator recounts other countries did, we would not have won the battle. If we had done just as they did, the Americans and British and French would not have won the battle at all.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I do not know that I can entirely agree with that statement, Mr. President. I am not now debating the question with the Senator; I am furnishing certain information. New

Zealand will not permit her boys to go out of the country until they are 21 years old. Australia will not permit her boys to go out of Australia until they are 19 years old. The United States is the only one of the Allied countries, so far as I know, which has not legislated upon this subject.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator from West Virginia may be correct. The statement I made was that we furnished men of 18 years of age while the other countries did not. There are reasons therefor, of course. But I want to call the Senate's attention to the fact that in this terrific war, in which we are about to be successful, the overwhelming majority of the soldiers and the munitions and the implements of war have been furnished by the American people. It is a magnificent contribution to the final victory which we will soon achieve. If what the military men say is true we would not be in the advantageous position we are today had we not been able to keep the pressure on the enemy. They said they used 18-year-olds with a limited amount of training, although they assert these men had what they call a sufficient amount of training. If we had not used those men I do not know what would have happened in the struggle. Certainly we would not have been successful had we failed to use them when our allies did not use such men at all.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. During January, February, and March 18-year-olds were sent abroad who had not had sufficient training. Let me ask the Senator from Kentucky if it is not a fact that there were older men in the United States at that time who had had training and who could have been shipped overseas, rather than sending 18-year-olds insufficiently trained, who could have been kept in this country and given 6 months' training in the United States.

Mr. CHANDLER. I assume the Army had older men. I do not know why they picked the younger men and did not pick the others. I think there were not very many in reserve here who had not already been committed to one sector of the world or another.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I may be wrong, but information was given to me by military officials who said they had older men in this country who had received sufficient training, but they preferred the younger men. If there were older men in this country at that time who had received sufficient training, and if some of them are still in this country, what excuse can there be for sending 18-year-olds overseas and putting them into combat service without any training whatsoever? As I said a moment ago, a mother wrote to me and said that her boy, who had been in the service more than 6 months, yet had been in a branch of the service in which he had not had a gun in his hand, and he had not had a gun in his hand until he got onto the battlefield. He was wounded there. She complained because of the fact that the boy who was 18 years old was sent overseas although he had never had a gun

in his hand and had not had training for the kind of service he was sent into.

Mr. CHANDLER. I agree with the Senator. If there were available experienced soldiers who could have carried on the battle it would be unwise to substitute others. I cannot give an answer in defense of a contrary decision.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee worries me, and I will state why. Let us consider the case of a man 30 years old who has been sent overseas. I happen to know of such a case. I am not speaking of what someone has told me, or repeating a rumor. I happen to know what I am about to state is a fact. A man 30 years old was sent overseas. He had one child 3½ years of age and another child 1½ years of age. He was not inducted into the Army until last July, but the latter part of December he was with Patton's army. I am wondering where we are to draw the line. The man 30 years old, of course, is older than a boy of 18, and he has had more experiences in life, and he may catch on to things a little faster by way of training and drilling. But I found in the last war that boys of 18 and 19 caught on so far as drilling is concerned, about as quickly as those of 26 or 30.

Mr. President, an amendment of the kind proposed by the Senator from Tennessee would certainly result in discriminating against such a man as the one to whom I have referred. When a man 30 years of age, who has lived long enough to bring into this world two fine children, is taken in the draft overnight and sent overseas and almost immediately finds himself with Patton's army fighting from street to street there is certainly something to be said about him as well as about the boy 18 years of age.

Mr. President, I appreciate what the Senator from Tennessee is trying to do by his amendment. I certainly have all the tenderness and consideration in the world for the boy who is 18 years of age, but I wish to say to the Senator that I would have to draw a pretty fine line of distinction between the one who has lived 30 years and has two children and a wife back home, and the boy who is 18 years old. The older one is placed in the same category as all others. By this amendment we would say to the older man, "You can go overseas. You have 3 children or 4 children. If you are 21 or 22 we will take you and within 6 weeks' time we will throw you into a replacement outfit in Germany or France or any other place, and you will become part of the group which is fighting over there." I will say to the Senator from Tennessee that the distinction is a difficult one for me to make, and it is one of the things that is worrying me about the amendment. It is difficult for me conscientiously to discriminate against such a man as the one man about whom I am talking now and about whom I personally know.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I make no difference between a man 18 years old and one 30 years old. Insofar as training is concerned, I do not think any man, regardless of age, should be sent into combat service unless he has



received adequate training. The distinction I make—and the line must be drawn somewhere—is on the basis of tenderness of years. Some boys at 18 years of age, as has been observed, I believe, by the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], are much more mature, both mentally and physically perhaps than other boys of the same age. Such a difference may occur even in the same family. One brother at a certain age may be much more advanced mentally and physically than another brother at the same age. As I have already stated, knowing that a great many boys at the tender age of 18 have been called into service, at an age when they are not even allowed to vote in any of the States of the Union except one, and that State passed such a law only since the war began, I am constrained to offer the amendment. At the age of 18 boys have not had experience in the affairs of this world, in business affairs, and have had very little experience of any other kind away from home. I think it is well nigh criminal to drag them suddenly from the fire-side of a quiet home and, as happens in a good many cases, place them in combat service within a relatively few weeks.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Of course, the amendment applies only to the boys who are inducted into the service.

Mr. STEWART. It applies only to the inductees.

Mr. LUCAS. And does not affect the boys who volunteered in the Army or Navy at 18 years of age?

Mr. STEWART. No.

Mr. LUCAS. Of course, the one who volunteers is in the same category so far as tenderness of years is concerned.

Mr. STEWART. No.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator does not think so?

Mr. STEWART. So far as training is concerned, of course, I agree that he should be trained. But a boy under 18 years cannot volunteer in the armed services without the consent of his parents.

Mr. LUCAS. I understand.

Mr. STEWART. No one is a better judge of a boy's mental maturity and physical maturity probably than his parents, and I assume they would not give such consent as is necessary to permit the boy to volunteer unless they felt that he was reasonably mature. I make a distinction between a volunteer and an inductee in that respect. An inductee has no choice. The law takes him, because the line is drawn at 18 years of age.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. I am interested to hear the Senator assert that this amendment would not apply to volunteers, because the Navy is now receiving practically all of its enlisted personnel from boys under 18 years of age who volunteer with the consent of their parents. Am I to understand from the Senator that his amendment would not be applicable to any person under the age of 18 who volunteers, either in the Army or Navy?

Mr. STEWART. That is correct. It was not the intention to have the amendment apply to such persons.

Mr. WALSH. As I understand, it applies only to those who are inducted or drafted.

Mr. STEWART. The language of the amendment precludes its application to the class referred to by the Senator from Massachusetts. The language of the amendment is "no man under 19 years of age who is inducted into the land or naval forces under the provisions of this act." I think that makes it perfectly plain that he must be inducted under the Selective Service Act.

Mr. WALSH. I am in sympathy with the objective of the Senator, and I agree with what the Senator says, that no person should be ordered into combat duty in the Army unless he has had 6 months' training. Of course, any person in the military service might accidentally find himself in a situation in which he would have to fight.

Mr. STEWART. That is correct.

Mr. WALSH. Before the Senator concludes, I shall offer an amendment, which I feel sure he will accept, clarifying the language of his amendment so that the Navy Department may train its inductees on naval vessels. I will submit the amendment to the Senator for his attention.

Mr. STEWART. I think I can safely say that there will be no objection to the amendment, because it was the purpose of the sponsors of the pending amendment to permit such training as is necessary, even though it be outside this country.

Mr. WALSH. Personally, I believe that the language of the amendment would not prevent the Navy from training its inductees on naval vessels, but the Navy Department is disturbed about it. At the proper time I shall ask the Senator to modify his amendment to take care of the situation that disturbs the Navy.

Mr. STEWART. I assume that the clarifying amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. I believe that the Senator from Illinois is correct. I do not know of any way in which we can justify making a discrimination between men 18 years of age and those 30 years of age, with two or three children. The only possible justification for it might be the situation in which we find ourselves today. I do not believe that anything we do about it will have a tremendous effect on the future conduct of the war.

I think I know why the Navy gets more volunteers than does the Army. The desire of a human being to live is fierce among all citizens of the country. The most rigorous service which a soldier is called upon to perform is the duty of a ground combat soldier. He is the man who must wade in the mud, endure heat and cold, and sleep on the ground. That is the toughest kind of service. We cannot blame many young men, if they are given a choice, for volunteering for service in the Navy. A man in the Navy,

unless he is under gunfire, or under bombing attacks for a few minutes, lives in comparative comfort.

The Senator from Illinois is exactly correct. A tremendous hardship is imposed on older soldiers. The record will show that they are not as good soldiers as the youngsters. We cannot blame the Army, which wants to get the war over, for wanting young men who do not know fear, and who can endure a great deal more punishment than can older men, who wish to live for the sake of their families. They are inclined to be a little more careful. The young man has nothing but the will to whip the other fellow. He has courage, and he can stand almost anything, until a bullet takes him out.

I do not believe that what we do will have a tremendous effect, because if our plans work out as we hope, we can finish the war against Japan without even using some of the trained divisions which we have. In the normal course, we will be able to defeat the Japanese after the war in Europe is over.

The Army, the Chief of Staff, the Secretary of War, and Senators have been under pressure from the mothers of young men, who are described as babies taken out of their arms. The mothers have the feeling that those young men have not had sufficient training to protect themselves. They know that the casualties are higher among those who have not had sufficient training. In my opinion we can hardly do too much in the way of training to give a man a chance to live.

I agree with the Senator from Illinois. I do not believe there is any way in which we can discriminate. If we relieve one man, we place a hardship on some other man. Taking into consideration the whole scheme of things, there is no word of comfort which we can offer to a mother whose baby is taken and placed in the line of fire, if she has justification for feeling that if he had had a little more time for training he could have saved himself. We must give consideration to that factor. My earnest plea is that the Senate give such consideration. Even if we do so now, it may not be harmful to the final victory. It may not be harmful to the final job which we are so anxious to complete satisfactorily, and it may give some relief to those who are already greatly overtaxed in these tragic times.

Mr. STEWART. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I have received a letter from the Secretary of the Navy with regard to certain amendments. I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the Record at this point as a part of my remarks.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Would the Senator from Massachusetts object to having the letter read at the desk? It deals with the pending amendment.

Mr. WALSH. I do not wish to interrupt the Senator who has the floor.

Mr. STEWART. That is quite all right. I am glad to yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the letter will be read.

The legislative clerk read the letter, as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,  
Washington, April 19, 1945.

HON. DAVID I. WALSH,  
Chairman of the Committee on  
Naval Affairs, United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Certain intended amendments to the bill H. R. 2625, proposing to amend the Selective Training and Service Act so as to restrict the utilization of men under 19 years of age in combat service until they have been given specified periods of training, have been called to my attention.

One of these proposed amendments relates to inductees and would prohibit ordering those under 19 years of age into combat service until given at least 6 months of training, and the other would prohibit ordering into combat service men under 19 years of age until given at least 1 year of training.

The effect of the adoption of either of these proposals would be disastrous to the administration of both the training and combat program and practices for the utilization of naval personnel and the conduct of naval operations.

Only the preliminary training of naval recruits and inductees can be conducted at naval shore training stations. Actual training in sea duties must perforce be carried out aboard ships. Consequently, men newly received in the naval service are retained at training stations only sufficiently long to indoctrinate them into naval routine and such preliminary naval instruction as can be given them during the period of adaptation from civilian to naval life and habits. The completion of their training is accomplished by assigning these recruits to ships where they are fitted into crews in the various stages of training and experience so that they can complete their training under actual seagoing conditions and under the supervision of more experienced personnel.

Further, it should be pointed out that large numbers of naval personnel have been and are being received in the Navy by enlistment under the induction age. These men enlist in the Navy, with their parents' consent, because they wish to fight.

In many cases it is true that new men do not see actual combat service for periods greater than either of those established in the proposed amendments. However, it would be utterly impossible to fit a program of restricted assignment into the necessary program of commissioning and manning new construction or of making replacements in operating ships of the Navy with the mandatory limitations in the two proposed amendments. To place statutory restrictions upon the utilization of naval personnel would impose such burdens upon the planning and operating forces of the Navy as to materially interfere with the present efficient prosecution of the war.

At the present time, in view of the manpower situation, every effort is being made to maintain the personnel of the Navy within the limits of its authorized strength. Recruits are principally for the purpose of taking care of attrition, and in cooperation with the Army, virtually all of the approximately 25,000 men per month being taken into the Navy are from the 17-year-age group. The Navy has reached that stage of the war where it has adequate ships to enable it to train men at sea. To be obliged to retain these men for the proposed specified periods at training stations ashore would require an expansion of facilities which are now being curtailed, an increase in the authorized strength, and in the retention of men in an ineffectual training status ashore.

It should also be pointed out that men encounter the same risks at sea whatever their age and that the risks are based largely

on the efficiency and training of those in a supervisory capacity which on every ship is composed of officers and petty officers with advanced training and mature experience. The performance of all of the numerous types and units of the Navy justifies approval of the continuance of the practices now in effect, without hampering arbitrary time limitations on utilization of men.

As to the Marine Corps, it is the present practice, even under the extreme combat pressure and high casualties encountered, to afford recruits 5 months' training in the United States and further training in a combat unit on the advanced fronts which is in preparation for future operations. It is the experience of the Marine Corps, based on its combat record, that this training is adequate.

In order to maintain unceasing pressure on the enemy at sea, which has advanced the end of the war beyond the anticipation of the enemy or of our people at home, it is absolutely essential to maintain the orderly progress of training and flow of replacements for those who have long sustained their efforts on the far-off battlefronts which cannot be accomplished, if restricted as proposed in the intended amendments.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES FORRESTAL.

MR. STEWART. Mr. President, does the Senator from Massachusetts wish to send the amendment to the desk and have it read?

MR. WALSH. Yes; I shall be glad to do so.

MR. STEWART. I yield for that purpose.

MR. WALSH. In this connection, Mr. President, I would submit for the record and for the consideration of the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee, the following amendment:

In line 8, after the word "training", change the period to a semicolon and insert the following:

this proviso—

In other words, the proviso in lines 4 to 8—

shall not be construed as preventing the assignment of enlisted men of the Navy or Coast Guard and the Reserve components thereof to duty for training on vessels of the Navy or Coast Guard and at naval bases beyond the continental limits of the United States.

I am sure there will be no objection to the amendment.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair inquires of the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] whether his amendment to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Tennessee and other Senators is to be taken up at a later time or is to be taken up at this time.

MR. WALSH. Mr. President, let me say first that I have offered my amendment at this time in order to give the Senator from Tennessee an opportunity to consider whether he will accept it as a part of his amendment.

MR. STEWART. I understood that each amendment was sent to the desk, to be read and to lie on the table and be printed.

MR. CHANDLER. Mr. President, a point of order.

THE PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

MR. CHANDLER. I understood that the Senator from Texas offered his

amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee and other Senators.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

MR. CHANDLER. If that is correct, it must be disposed of before any other amendment to the amendment can be considered, it seems to me.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

MR. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I offered my amendment as a substitute for the amendment proposed by the Senator from Tennessee and other Senators.

MR. WALSH. Mr. President, I presented my amendment, not as an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee, but to have him consider whether he would accept it. I did not ask for its consideration at this time.

MR. STEWART. I am sure that any clarifying amendment of that sort would be acceptable, but I must consider it a little before I actually agree to accept it.

MR. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, a point of order.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

MR. REVERCOMB. As I understand the situation, the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas was offered as a substitute, and it is the pending question.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

MR. REVERCOMB. Therefore, the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee and other Senators is not open to further amendment at this time. Is not that correct?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

MR. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, a point of order.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

MR. JOHNSON of Colorado. A sponsor of the so-called Stewart amendment has the right to perfect his amendment at any time; does he not?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. It can be modified or amended at any time before the yeas and nays are ordered.

MR. JOHNSON of Colorado. A sponsor of the amendment has the right to perfect his own amendment; does he not?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. He does, by modifying it, before the yeas and nays are ordered.

MR. JOHNSON of Colorado. The point I make is that the Senator from Tennessee can perfect his amendment by accepting the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts; can he not?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. If he wishes to perfect his amendment, he may do so.

MR. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is my point.

MR. STEWART. Mr. President, the Senator from Massachusetts simply requested that the amendment be read for the information of the Senate. I assume that we shall discuss at a later time the matter of whether it will be acceptable. I assume we shall not be able to



complete action on the bill this afternoon; that has been my feeling.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for an observation?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. The letter from the Secretary of the Navy was read. I received the impression that he thinks the amendment applies to volunteers. Certainly the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee does not do that. That is why I asked specific questions of the Senator from Tennessee. I did so in order to make definite and certain that the amendment does not apply to volunteers, but applies only to inductees.

Mr. STEWART. I think I can say to the Senator from Massachusetts that, so far as I am concerned—and I think the coauthors of the amendment will take the same position—we can agree to accept the amendment to our amendment or to clarify the amendment in some way or other in relation to the matter referred to by the Secretary of the Navy with respect to the training of volunteers on vessels at sea.

Mr. President, amendments of this character were considered by the Senate in October 1942. At that time the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the same Senator who has presented an amendment today, presented an amendment which had for its purpose the prevention of the drafting of men under 20 years of age. If my memory serves me correctly, that amendment was adopted by the Senate, despite the fact that it was opposed at least by the War Department. I do not recall what the attitude of the Navy Department was at that time. At that time a letter was written by General Marshall. He undertook to point out what he called or referred to as a misapprehension on the part of both laymen and legislators on the Hill with respect to the length of training a young man would receive. In his letter he said, among other things, that there was a difference between the training of a full division and the training of individual soldiers—in other words, that there was a difference in the length of time required. I now read excerpts from his letter. It is dated October 23, 1942, and is signed by Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff. He said:

I believe that this originates—

Namely, the desire to prevent the induction of boys under 20 years of age—from a desire to avoid the unfortunate instances of the First World War, in which many men were sent to front-line combat before they had had any reasonable amount of training; and second, on the assumption that, since the War Department has frequently stated that it takes 12 months to train a division, there should be no objection to guaranteeing 12 months' training for each enlisted man.

Later in his letter he opposed, as the Army does today, the passage of such legislation. He pointed out that an individual—for instance, a rifleman—can be given basic training within a period of a few weeks, and that he can be sent as a replacement to take his place beside older fighting men, or veterans, and that he can do so with safety after a comparatively few weeks of training, but that in order to give full and complete train-

ing to an entire division of men, so as to prepare them for combat, they should have 12 months of training, or even more, inasmuch as they are trained as a unit, because we assume that they are all untrained men to begin with. Yet 18-, 19-, and 20-year-old boys are taken for replacement troops, and placed beside veteran troops with the expectation that they are as safe as the veteran soldiers themselves who have had previous training and experience in combat service.

I believe that every Senator understands that it is not the theory of the proponents of this amendment that young boys should merely be given training as a unit. We had in mind the thing which General Marshall pointed out in his letter of 1942, namely, that there was a difference between the training of men who formed a part of a 12,000 or 14,000 unit, and the training of soldiers who were to be used for replacements. The amendment is based on the theory that men 18 years of age in many instances are too young to be placed in the front ranks as combat troops. As I said a few moments ago, I think there is a human side to the situation which should be taken into consideration. I do not believe I was present when the amendments to which I have referred were agreed to in 1942, but I was in favor of them. I believed that it was unfortunate that we had to draft boys as young as 18 years of age. Of course, a line must be drawn at some point; an age line must be established in some manner. Therefore, after the insistence on the part of the Army on drafting boys 18 years of age, we agreed on a dividing line between those who should be drafted and those who should not be drafted.

We also recognized that oftentimes boys 18 years of age are sufficiently matured to become sailors, soldiers, or marines. With the consent of the parents, the law permits a boy 17 years of age to volunteer his services. I believe the Navy is now accepting boys of that age. I believe the Army does not accept volunteers of any age at the present time. We have had very little, if any, legislation bearing upon that point since October 1942. I am speaking now from memory only.

Mr. President, I repeat what I have already said. I feel that the war has now reached the stage where the Members of the Congress may feel at liberty to assert themselves and express their feelings with regard to the drafting of and pressing into service of 18-year-old boys.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I heard a discussion on the floor of the Senate between the able Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] and the able Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] on the subject in the course of which I believe the Senator from Illinois called attention to the fact that a great many married men with children were being required to go into military service. As I was walking through the corridor after hearing the conversation I was hailed by some boys who identified themselves as having come

from Florida. There were five of them. I took them into the gallery and somewhat about the Capitol. I asked them how old they were. They all told me that their ages varied from 28 to 30. I said, "You boys look somewhat older than the ordinary men in the service." They then told me their ages. I asked them if they were married and they told me they were married. I asked them if they had any children. They said, "Yes; we all have children. Each one of us has at least two children." As the Senator from Illinois pointed out, that is a serious situation. Here were five men who had respective businesses, their wives, and their little children. They were all under the age of 30. When we consider boys 18 years of age we also must keep in mind the men within the age group to which I have referred.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. We are now discussing the question of whether boys 18 years of age should be given 6 months of training before being put into active combat. I agree that men who are married should receive 6 months of training before being sent overseas. As a matter of fact, every soldier in the Army, whether under 18 years of age or older than 18 years of age, should receive 6 months of training before being put into active combat service. The fact has been developed that many boys are looked upon by their mothers as not being more than babies. They are taken into the Army and put into combat service. It may be that previously they never had a gun in their hands and did not know how to shoot a gun. That is a different situation from that of the man of the world who knows how to handle himself.

I have much sympathy with the men who are married and have children, because I certainly made a fight to try to keep the Army from taking the fathers and breaking up the homes of America. But I was voted down on that in the committee and on the floor of the Senate.

When we look around and see what is happening in Australia and happening in England and realize that in some countries boys are not being taken unless they are 21 years, and in others until they are 19, when in England itself they are not being taken until they are 18 years and 6 months old, what do the people of the United States think? It is all right to be generous; but it seems to me that this country and the people of the country have been more than generous, and have done far more than their part in this war, with reference to food, with reference to materials, with reference to ammunition, and with reference to American boys. Certainly we should have as much interest in the 18-year-old "babies," as some of the mothers refer to them, as England has in her 18-year-old boys. Certainly she has a greater stake in the war than almost any other country in the world. Certainly Canada has a great stake in the war. But it was only a short time ago that no boy from Canada was sent overseas unless he actually volunteered.

Go across the line today in Canada and see what is happening. I received



a letter from a doctor friend of mine who has just returned from Canada indicating that it is possible to get all the meat in Canada one wants without any points, to get all the butter one wants without any points, to get all the cheese one wants without any points. We can go to Canada and buy anything we want to buy, without any ration points. We can go into a hotel, and on the bill of fare we will find listed roast beef, steaks, pork chops, almost anything one could have had before the war.

Mr. President, I am in favor of helping the Allies and doing everything we can to win the war, but certainly it seems to me that we should not be called upon to do the whole thing, when other countries, which are directly affected, are not going as far as we are asked to go; and we should always remember that Mr. Churchill said, "Give us the tools, and we will do the rest." We should not be called upon to do everything, to furnish the money, to furnish the boys, to furnish the "babies," to furnish the food, and to furnish the ammunition for all the world.

If laws can be passed in the other countries providing that their "babies" are not to be taken, how can anyone stand on the floor of the Senate and say that we in the United States should send our boys into battle without having at least 6 months' training?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I am not informed about the age limit at which England takes her men, but the Senator recalls that Britain has had a draft of women practically ever since the beginning of the war, does he not?

Mr. WHEELER. Does the Senator want to draft the women in this country?

Mr. PEPPER. No; but I thought the Senator meant to imply that we were using our 18-year-old boys and going all out for the war, and she was not using her 18-year-old boys and is not going all out for the war, and I thought it pertinent to remind the Senator that England had been drafting her women ever since the beginning of the war, and that we were not. That is some indication, I believe, that they are going all out for the war.

Mr. WHEELER. I have no doubt that they go all out for the war, because they have to; and I give them credit for doing that. I think some of the mothers in this country would themselves rather be drafted than to see their "babies," 18 years old, who have had no experience, and no training, taken and sent into the service, when they have never had a gun in their hands. To me that is an inhuman and a wrong and cruel thing to do, and it cannot be justified, under the conditions.

I do not personally know, but the statement was made on the floor of the Senate by the Senator from West Virginia this afternoon as a fact that England was not taking her boys and shipping them across the channel, unless they were 18 years and 6 months old, and had had combat training. I say it is wrong to take men even of 30 years of age, with wives and babies, and put them into com-

bat service, until they have had at least 6 months' training.

If the Members of the Senate will recall, testimony was adduced before the Committee on Military Affairs, and statements have been made on the floor of the Senate time and time again, indicating that the reason why we needed the draft law and required a tremendously large army in this country at the outset, was that we wanted to give the men a year's training before they were sent overseas. That was the testimony of the military leaders, and that has been the statement on the floor of the Senate by men who advocated some of the measures which were passed. There cannot be any excuse, it seems to me, when we have men in this country who have had a year's training or more than a year's training, for taking these boys without any training and sending them into combat service.

After all, we should think something about the United States of America and the morale of the people of this country. Mark my words, when the war is over and the facts are known it will be found that the American people will not be so anxious to give their country away and to give everything else away, as some people have been led to believe they are at the present time.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I am not a member of the Committee on Military Affairs, and I do not know whether the able Senator from Montana has read the evidence, but I do not suppose he literally means that men were sent overseas without any training.

Mr. WHEELER. Oh, yes; I mean that some of these boys have been sent overseas literally without any training.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator would do a great public service if he could get the cases and disclose them to the Senate, and demand an investigation and an inquiry, and make known the results to the country, because we all know that that never should have happened, and according to the advice I have repeatedly had from the War Department, it was never intended to happen. They say that an infantryman who is going to use a rifle, and is actually to be in ordinary infantry rifle combat, can be trained in a shorter period of time than are men who are to do more complicated work, and that the period of training the man receives is graduated by the kind of service he is to render. But, of course, if anyone has been sent overseas without the minimum training the military people find to be proper, it is a national scandal, and the Senator would render a great public service by disclosing the cases so that the officers guilty could be brought to trial.

Mr. WHEELER. A lady sent me a copy of a letter her son had written her. I have it in my office, and I think I can locate it. He said he had never had a gun in his hand. I think he had been in the service, but he had been in office employment, or doing something of that kind, and had never had a gun in his hand until he got into the combat service. Perhaps the boy was lying to his

mother, but that was what was stated in the letter she sent me, and I assumed it to be true.

The Army itself has admitted that it has not given them 6 months' training, but certainly the statement previously made was that it was necessary to give a year's training not only to the 18-year-olds, but to all the others. Perhaps the authorities have discovered since that time that it is not necessary to give them a year's training; perhaps 6 months' training is all that is needed. But surely, when these boys go into combat service, I want to know they have had the proper kind of training in order to protect their lives.

We know that the Germans have taken boys 14 years of age and sent them into combat service, and that the Russians have done likewise. The American people have been shocked to learn that Germany would send "babies" into service and have them slaughtered upon the battlefields, and we have been shocked to hear that women in Russia are going into the combat service, as we have been told is the case. But, after all, we have prided ourselves that we are more civilized, more Christianlike, than some nations that have done such things.

Mr. President, the United States will not lower its standard of civilization as the Germans, with their barbarity, have lowered their standard in this war. We will not lower our standard to the point where the Japs have lowered theirs. In this war the United States has rendered a greater service than any country on the face of the globe.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I am in complete and full accord and sympathy with the leaders of the armed forces of our country and with what they are doing in the prosecution of the war. For that matter, I believe every Member of this body is perfectly willing, and has in most cases where he has had an opportunity to demonstrate it shown his willingness, to do everything he can to aid the progress of this war. The Senate of the United States has not been niggardly in any respect in dealing with anything that has been before it in connection with the prosecution of the war. I am just as anxious for full and complete and speedy victory as any other man in America or elsewhere. I am sure my colleagues feel the same way.

Mr. President, we have given of the substance of our land until it hurts. We have drained the resources of this country until we know that a serious problem will be faced in the post-war period. We have emptied the Treasury.

Recently we passed a measure authorizing an increase of the national debt to \$300,000,000,000, an amount of money which 4 or 5 years ago would have staggered the imagination of practically every Member of this body. I remember the time when we appropriated the first \$5,000,000,000 to prepare for national defense. One of the finest men who ever graced this Chamber, who since that day has gone on to his reward, the late Alva Adams, of Colorado, had charge of the bill on the floor. He was chairman of the subcommittee before which the hearings were held on the bill which appropriated \$5,000,000,000, if I correctly



remember the figure, for the purpose of building training camps throughout this land, for the purpose of constructing airports, for the purpose of equipping men, for the purpose of manufacturing munitions with which to fight a war which we thought might come to us. I remember that as he stood at his desk—and I seem to see him now—he said, "This staggering amount of money, this \$5,000,000,000, shocks me. It is a tremendous amount of money. Do we actually need it?" Many other Senators felt the same way.

Since that day, Mr. President, we have passed legislation authorizing the increase of the national debt to \$300,000,000,000. The two Houses of the Congress have been liberal in every respect. We have given of our substance. We have given of the youth of our land. We have yielded to the request of the leaders of the armed forces that boys 18 years of age might be drafted, and we have left it to the discretion of the leaders to send the boys into battle wherever they please, and we have given permission, in addition thereto, for them to draft boys, with their parents' consent, when they are only 17 years of age. We have not been niggardly. We have not held back. America has struck with all her force and all her might, until the day has drawn nigh, we hope, when final victory will be quickly realized upon European soil.

Mr. President, as a consequence of what we have done we are told that many boys 17 and 18 years old have been killed in battle. We have received agonizing letters from their mothers and their fathers asking why it is necessary that we rob the cradle to fight this war.

Mr. President, we have allies in this war, nations many of which have large resources and much manpower. I do not say that some of them have not given as freely as we have. I do not make that charge. We are in this war to the finish and we will carry it through. But I know that the time approaches now when we can afford to discontinue the practice of drafting and sending to the front, to give their life's blood, to die in behalf of this democracy we love, children, many of whom have never had any experience in the affairs of life. Many of them have gone through experiences of which it is difficult for the human mind to conceive. They have seen their comrades bleeding and dying all around them, and we are told that many of the youth of this land, many of these children who have been drafted and sent into service, are probably permanent mental cases. We have a right to demand that before they are sent into battle they be seasoned so far as it is possible to season them.

Mr. President, I feel I am justified in offering my amendment, which simply provides that a paltry 6 months' training be provided so as to season a lad and prepare him physically and mentally to go out yonder to that front where men by the thousands are dying every day.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. I think it is no longer necessary to withhold from the American people just how magnificent a contribution in manpower the people of

America have made to the success of this war. There may have been some reason before for withholding such information, but in February the Secretary of War sent a letter to Representative MAHON, Democrat, of Texas, who is a member of the House Appropriations Committee, and according to the figures the Secretary of War gave to the Representative from Texas there were approximately 8,050,000 American soldiers in the Army in February.

Mr. STEWART. That is in the Army alone. The Senator is not speaking of the Navy and the Marines?

Mr. CHANDLER. In the Army alone; not including the Navy and the Marines; 8,050,000 soldiers were in the Army in February. Of that number, 5,150,000 were overseas. Think of it, Mr. President, 5,150,000 American boys were overseas.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I am glad that the distinguished Senator from Kentucky has brought out the point which he has mentioned. The question has been asked on this floor many times this afternoon as to how many men have been left in this country. My friends the distinguished Senator from Kentucky and the distinguished Senator from Tennessee and I are members of the Committee on Military Affairs. The evidence before our committee showed that there were left in this country, or this hemisphere, very few who were not in certain categories, such as those returned from battle service, and those on limited service. Am I correct?

Mr. CHANDLER. In February there were only 2,900,000 soldiers in the United States. Approximately half of them, or 1,400,000, had been earmarked and were being trained for overseas service.

Mr. MAYBANK. Since the time has come to disclose the figures, I am happy that the Senator from Kentucky agrees with me, because I know that he knows the facts, as does the Senator from Tennessee. The only thought I have to offer to the Senate is that there are in the United States very few trained and able soldiers who have not been in battle, or who are not suffering from minor or serious ailments. Am I correct?

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator is correct. They are either overseas or they have been committed to go overseas. About 1,400,000 of them either have gone or are in the process of going, or will go whenever soldiers can be returned from overseas to replace them in the United States.

I am anxious, now that it is not so important to the security of the country or to our eventual victory, that the American people be told the facts, because the blood and treasure and possessions of the American people are wholly committed to this war. There is no way to turn back. We have committed ourselves far beyond what anyone ever imagined would be necessary when the original commitments were made to help our allies. The American people have never made any such commitments in strength and in treasure in all the history of this country.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. It was not my purpose to bring out the American commitments, of which the Senator has spoken so ably, because war is death and destruction. It was my purpose to bring out—and I appreciate the opportunity to do so—as a member of the Military Affairs Committee, the fact that the statements which have been made, to the effect that there are a great many soldiers left in this country who can go overseas to fight the war, are incorrect.

Mr. CHANDLER. The War Department states in this memorandum that of the residue of 2,900,000, 180,000 are in Army hospitals, and 1,300,000 are in essential administrative and service jobs, concerned with overseas supplies, plane maintenance, cargo loading, communications, and transportation. It is the policy and plan of the War Department, if I correctly understand the Secretary's statement, to send overseas and use in overseas service all those except the ones who are physically disqualified. Of course, there would be no point in sending overseas those who are physically disqualified, or who can perform only limited service.

Every time we say anything about the American contribution to this total war, and to the victory, we are told about what someone else has done, and an effort is made to minimize American endeavor by magnifying what someone else has done. I am delighted that others have been able to contribute as much as they have contributed. I wish they could have contributed more. But let it be said to the eternal credit of the courage and determination of the American people that when we undertake a job we do not do it by half-way measures. We have committed ourselves wholly, in money, lives, and treasure, beyond anything ever contemplated by the American people before the war, or after we became involved in it.

I do not know what credit eventually will be given. There will be enough credit for all if we share it. But when the war is over, let no citizen of the world, especially in America, attempt to minimize, or permit to be minimized, the magnificent contribution of the American people to this victory. The Chief of Staff and others who have been living with the war day and night are weary. They are not able to stand criticism as they were when it started. They are not as fresh as they were. As my dear friend from South Carolina will remember, not long ago we were able to say to some of them, "Be of good courage, every one is weary". The casualty lists continue to come in. The hearts of men and women in America continue to be broken every day by the loss of the most prized possession on earth—a son or daughter.

It is time for the American people, not in a spirit of boastfulness, or bragging, to take a dead-level rest and call the attention of our own people and of the people of all the world to the fact that we have made this magnificent contribution in good faith—a contribution which in my opinion exceeds the



contribution of all the others. We did it because of the voluntary spirit of determination of the American people. By voluntary methods we have exceeded the production of all our friends and all our enemies combined. That was the reason why some of us fought tooth and nail against changing the rules in America, and against a bill which sought to impose compulsion on the American people. We have not needed it. We do not need it now.

I believe that all of us can take pride in the generation to which we belong. As each generation of young Americans comes along, the older generation is likely to say, "This is a bad set. They do not know how to do things."

Our youngsters today are smarter than all the American boys we have ever produced in all the time we have been a country. They can do more things, and do them better and more quickly. They have mastered the machines.

The Senator from Illinois knows that in our time the boys were willing, but awkward. However, the present generation of young Americans represents the genius of the world. The contribution of the stalwart sons of America has made victory possible. Without their contribution, in my opinion, victory could not have been gained. Let every American in the country stand up and feel proud of the fact that his generation kept its rendezvous with destiny and made this magnificent contribution to the freedom of mankind.

The present generation of Americans has won the fight again. The last time someone lost the peace. Our soldiers did not lose the fight. They won the fight. They are going to win the fight again; and it is up to those of us who occupy these seats to see that what they have won is not lost. We are going to do that this time. We must do it. We cannot stand another war. The world cannot stand another war. We cannot finance another war.

Yesterday or the day before a very distinguished and learned doctor came before the Committee on Military Affairs and stated that this country was worth \$30,000,000,000,000. Does any Senator know how much money that is? I have no idea. Some of us suggested rather meekly that we would like to know if he could tell us how to find \$300,000,000,000 to pay our debts. I assume that \$30,000,000,000,000 is somewhat more than \$300,000,000,000.

Mr. President, I do not wish to take any more of the time of my friend from Tennessee. As the Senator from Tennessee says, the Senate of the United States has never failed, in a single instance, either before the war or since, to give to the military authorities of this country everything they asked for in order properly and vigorously to prosecute this war. I know that I have never failed. I know that the Senator from Illinois has never failed.

Now we have a right to scrutinize the picture. That is not only our right, but our duty. At the close of the last war, on the 12th of November 1918, \$6,000,000,000 worth of surplus property had accumulated. That was considered a staggering amount of surplus property. In that war

we sent overseas approximately 2,020,000 soldiers. In this war we have already sent overseas 5,150,000 soldiers. That will give some idea of the difference. At this moment there is scattered about the world more than \$100,000,000,000 worth of surplus property belonging to the men, women, and children of the United States. We justify that by saying that war is a costly and wasteful thing, that we must have sufficient men and supplies; that in war those who fail to have sufficient men and supplies lose, and those who lose, lose everything; that we must win, and that we cannot win unless we have the power to carry the fight to the enemy. If the enemy ever forces you on the defensive the only chance you have is to lose, although, of course, no one will know exactly when you will lose.

With the help of our allies we were able to hold the line until we were ready. In this war the American people have demonstrated again that they can develop the greatest offensive power on earth; but the development of such power takes time. We were not ready when we entered this war, but our allies enabled us to take the time we needed in order to become ready. I hope that hereafter we shall always be ready; I hope that never again shall we find ourselves unprepared, for we may not have enough time again. In the past we have always had time to prepare ourselves for war. It is not certain that next time we shall have time to do so. So far we have always needed it. The next time we must be ready, because the next war may come up suddenly. The learned doctor to whom I have referred said it might come in a short time, perhaps in 20 years. He said that when it does come airplanes carrying 50,000 tons of bombs will come over a city like Washington and he predicted that they would be able to wipe out a city the size of Washington in 10 minutes. I do not know whether that will happen, but that is one of the predictions of what will come to pass in the future. We must be ready for it. We must save the victory that our boys have won for us abroad. We must make our country secure.

Mr. President, I have not observed that the leaders of the other governments have been hesitant to proclaim what they have been able to do. They have never failed to say what they have been able to do. I do not wish to speak in derogation of what they have been able to contribute, but I say it is high time that American Senators stood up and said to them, "Look at what we have done." It is high time that they recognized the contributions made by the American people. God knows we were willing to make them in the interest of restoring peace to the world, but we should not fail to inform the American people of the extent of their contributions. Thus far we have failed to tell them. It is high time that we were giving our own people some idea of their magnificent contributions.

I wish to repeat what I said when my good friend the Senator from Colorado was temporarily out of the Chamber, namely, that the Army justified the use of these young men on the theory that they have to keep the pressure on the enemy, and that it is necessary to change

the procedure which has previously been followed. Previously the Army would have a division fighting for a certain season, and then would take it out and would put in a new division. When casualties occurred in a division young men would be sent in as replacements; the young men would be mixed or infiltrated among the men who were veterans in the division, and in that way the division would be kept in the fight and would be kept going.

A Senator who votes for war—and we are the ones who voted for war—a Senator who votes taxes on the people to support the war, and we did that—has a definite obligation to the American people. There are some Americans who think Senators are "nosey" if they go beyond that; some Americans think that Senators have no other obligation. I claim that Senators have an obligation to walk, as closely as the circumstances permit, with the soldier who offers his life to his country in its effort to win the war. There are some things which must be explained in order to be appreciated. I have seen American soldiers who have been too long in a military area. I have seen a thousand-foot stare on a soldier in a 10-foot room. I have seen American soldiers who went out in the morning with the bloom of youth on their faces, in the determination to strike a blow for their country, and I have seen them come back at night mangled and bruised. I have seen them lifted from military airplanes and taken to the hospital; I have seen them dead. I refuse to fail to discharge my obligation and my responsibility to walk as closely with them as the circumstances permit, and to be interested enough to try to see whether we can give them a little better chance to live.

Mr. President, I am grateful to the Senator from Tennessee for giving me this opportunity to speak. I hope I have not trespassed too greatly on his time.

Mr. STEWART. Not at all. I think the Senator has made a substantial contribution. I wish to say, with him, that I, too, have the highest regard for the American soldier. I repeat that I also have the highest regard and respect for our leaders in this war, of whom we are proud. I refer to all our leaders in the armed forces. America does not need to hold her head down in shame or even in the slightest embarrassment when the leaders of her armed forces are compared to the leaders of the armed forces of any of our allies or of any of our enemies. I pay to our leaders the highest tribute. I am proud of them. They are great, and they are wonderful in their greatness. They are fighting a great war. But I cannot see the necessity for rushing the youth of our land into this war.

Mr. AUSTIN and Mr. MAYBANK addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. STEWART. I yield first to the Senator from Vermont, and then I will yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, in order that my colleagues in the Senate may have available some of the evidence on



the basis of which the Committee on Military Affairs acted, I request permission to have printed in the RECORD following my brief statement certain documents which I shall describe in a moment. One of them is a letter from General Marshall, dated last month, addressed to Representative WILLIAM E. HESS, of Ohio. In the letter appears a statement which bears upon the claim made several times today that there is available for military use a pool of manpower which can be resorted to—a pool composed of men other than those 18 years of age. I read the following statement by General Marshall, and I point out that the letter was written last month:

For the past 6 months we have been combating the coastal defense commands and our bases in Alaska and the Caribbean for men who are suitable for infantry replacements, they themselves to be replaced by personnel of such physical limitations that they could not be employed in combat service. The same procedure is being followed through all the rear areas in the overseas theaters. Yet we are still short in replacements and under the heaviest pressure from our field commanders to obtain them.

The choice in the matter is very clear; either we must accept delays in operations in Europe and in the Pacific or we must follow the present procedure. There is no other course. To delay the operations now under way would, in my opinion, be a tragic error, resulting in an inevitably increased loss in life by the prolongation of the war. I am quite certain that the people of the United States would not make this choice.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the following papers:

(A) Synopsis of military manpower situation; (B) tabulation by years of age of reserve of manpower for combat replacements; (C) letter from General Marshall to Senator REYNOLDS, October 23, 1942, to which the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee has referred, explaining why it is inadvisable to incorporate in law a requirement for 12 months' training for men under 20 years of age before they may be sent into combat; (D) letter from Brigadier General Irvine to Hon. JAMES W. WADSWORTH explaining training program for units and for replacements and War Department directives on order in which men are sent into combat, dated January 17, 1945; (E) letter from General Marshall to Hon. WILLIAM E. HESS, dated March 5, 1945, explaining the War Department's consistent opposition to statutory requirements as to length of training required before men of certain age groups can be sent into combat and explaining the effective training men receive and the effects such restrictions would have. He states that the Army has been combed for men suitable for replacements, with the result that 500,000 men were withdrawn from assignments other than divisional, 90,000 were transferred from air service forces, 40,000 withdrawn from antiaircraft artillery, all to be retrained as infantry replacements. He stated that coastal defense commands were being similarly combed, but that they were still short of replacements.

I ask unanimous consent that these papers be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the documents were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Army developed a training program under which effective combat divisions were created from civilians. This required a minimum of 1 year's intensive training.

The effectiveness of this training has been demonstrated in all the theaters of operation in high-speed sustained offensives carried out by green troops against a veteran enemy.

Its efficiency has been shown in casualties substantially below estimates based on the previous experience of our allies and the fact that our troops have inflicted considerably greater losses on the enemy than they themselves have suffered.

The Army likewise developed a training plan for replacements to be fed individually into trained combat teams. This training takes from 13 to 17 weeks and no man is sent to a combat unit until after individual tests have proved that he has absorbed the necessary training to qualify him as a replacement in his particular assignment.

The efficacy of this training has been demonstrated through the number of units that have absorbed such replacements during combat over a period of months without suffering any loss of combat efficiency. This program of continuous replacements has permitted a sustained velocity of attack over a period of months never before possible which has been a material factor in preventing the enemy from reorganizing in new strong defensive positions. This both shortens the war and decreases our total battle losses.

The policy of the War Department has been not to use any men under 19 years of age in combat as long as any other men suitable for combat replacements were available. Pursuant to this policy the entire Army, including the Air Force, was combed for men physically suitable for infantry and armor combat replacements.

Not until the middle of November 1944 was the ban on sending 18-year-olds as infantry and armor replacements lifted at which time it had become impossible to meet the requirements of the various theaters for replacements from other manpower sources.

Had a ban existed on the use of 18-year-olds, it would have been impossible to have maintained the continuous offensive in Europe at its rapid pace and the enemy would have gained additional time to reorganize his forces for fresh defensive lines or even another counteroffensive like the one he launched in December. The result of restricting the use of 18-year-olds when military necessity required their use would have been increased loss of life, not a saving, and a prolongation of the war.

The War Department has consistently followed a policy of using 18-year-olds in combat only when military necessity compels, and that is still its policy. Any arbitrary prohibition by law of the use of 18-year-olds can only operate as a brake that may slow down military operations at a most critical phase. In certain theaters where climatic conditions almost stop military operations for a prolonged period the loss of speed in an offensive might result in the loss of the entire objectives of a campaign.

As of February 1, 1945, our estimated reserve of civilian manpower fit for military duty and within the effective combat ages of 18 to 25, inclusive, was down to 279,000 men, of whom 133,000 were aged 18. Besides this, there will be available only those who become 18 years of age each month.

A British officer inspecting our replacement training system expressed amazement at its thoroughness and stated that they would not dream of attempting any such intensive training for basic replacements.

Manpower reservoir, Feb. 1, 1945

Age	Deferred, except agricultural	Nondeferred	Total	Probable yield to armed forces
18 years.....	13,600	253,000	266,600	133,900
19 years.....	14,100	35,200	49,300	24,650
20 years.....	9,300	28,200	37,500	18,750
21 years.....	9,500	24,100	33,600	16,800
22 years.....	11,300	27,200	38,500	19,250
23 years.....	13,200	25,000	38,200	19,100
24 years.....	17,500	26,600	44,100	22,050
25 years.....	21,600	28,200	49,800	24,900
Total.....	110,100	447,500	557,600	278,800

All other males within the above age groups have already been found physically unfit for full military service or are deferred by law.

The above list of deferred includes men of the merchant marine, who are as necessary to the war as troops or Navy personnel, and those engaged in war production.

Of the possible reserve of military manpower between ages 18 and 25, inclusive, almost one-half are age 18.

Other than the above there is no further source of military manpower to maintain the combat efficiency of the armed forces except those men becoming 18 years of age each month.

WAR DEPARTMENT,  
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF STAFF,  
Washington, October 23, 1942.  
Hon. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR REYNOLDS: In the discussion of the proposed legislation to lower the selective-service age, the proposal has frequently been made that a provision be written into the law that would make 12 months' training mandatory before any individual under 20 years of age could be sent to a theater of operations.

I believe that this originates partly from a desire to avoid the unfortunate instances of the First World War, in which many men were sent to front-line combat before they had any reasonable amount of training; and, second, on the assumption that, since the War Department has frequently stated that it takes 12 months to train a division, there should be no objection to guaranteeing 12 months' training for each enlisted man.

Such a limitation would impose an almost impossible administrative problem for the War Department. There is a marked difference between the training of an individual soldier and the training of a complicated machine like a division. Every soldier receives approximately 3 months' basic training. In this period he is hardened physically and trained technically, as well as given an understanding of discipline. He is taught how to care for himself in the field; how to employ both his primary and secondary weapons; and how he and his weapons fit into the squad and platoon. Upon completion of this course, he is a qualified rifleman, machine gunner, mortarman, etc., depending upon which course he pursued in the replacement center.

Upon completion of his basic training the soldier is assigned to a tactical unit. If the unit is new—that is, recently organized—there then begins the team training that every unit must have before it can be considered an efficient combat organization. The length of time required for this team training

varies, of course, with the type and size of the unit. A squad of 12 men who have had proper basic training can be trained as a team in a relatively short period of time. A battalion takes considerably longer. A division which is a complicated organization involving the combined use of many arms, must have a long training period before it becomes a real combat organization. For this 12 months is the minimum, and during this 12 months' period units that make up the divisions go through periods of small unit training, advanced unit training, training with the combined arms, and then extensive field maneuvers with the division acting alone and in combination with other divisions and corps and Army troops.

To get back to the training of an individual soldier, the length of his training before he can be fitted into an experienced tactical unit varies according to the type of unit and the duties for which he is trained. A few examples will illustrate what I mean by this:

In the Air Corps, a soldier selected for ground crew (mechanics) training first receives a period of basic military training. He then goes to an Air Corps technical school, and the length of his training there depends upon the specific specialty in which he is being trained. The period may vary from 18 to 36 weeks, and when he graduates he is, for example, a finished airplane engine mechanic and can be immediately assigned to and used in a bombardment group as a mechanic, whether it is still itself in training or is in a combat theater.

A radio operator receives his basic training and his training as an operator simultaneously. In from 3 to 5 months he is an effective operator, trained in Army radio procedure and, as in the case of the airplane mechanic, can take his place in a signal company of a combat division, whether that division is still in training or is being committed to combat.

A rifleman, when he finishes his 13 weeks' basic training, is prepared to take his place in an experienced squad at any time. If 8 or 10 men in the squad have had team training, the trained basic rifleman can be inserted in the squad without detriment either to himself or his unit.

I could give you many other examples where it would be unnecessary and undesirable to hold a man out of a combat theater for 12 months. It would be almost impossible for the Army to operate under any such mandate. We would, in effect, have to put thousands upon thousands of men "on the shelf" after their essential training had been completed before we could use them. In the Air Corps alone possibly 500,000 such men would be involved. Incidentally, the Navy and the Marine Corps enlist men of 17, and I am told that the average age of the entire corps is below 20.

The proposal would create so many obstacles of this nature that I cannot too strongly emphasize the importance of giving us this legislation without crippling limitations. Trust our judgment and our own insistence that we fight only with properly trained units, to see that each soldier has adequate training before he enters combat. I am certain Members of Congress do not wish to hamper the War Department in the execution of the tremendous task we have before us. These proposals, I am sure, arise through a lack of understanding of the problem presented. Our enemies are desperate and implacable. Our task is extremely difficult.

Faithfully yours,

G. C. MARSHALL,  
Chief of Staff.

JANUARY 17, 1945.

HON. JAMES W. WADSWORTH,  
House of Representatives,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WADSWORTH: In the absence of Maj. Gen. Ray E. Porter, to whom your letter

of January 11 is addressed, I shall present the views and policies of the War Department concerning the training and overseas assignment of replacements, with particular reference to the points emphasized by Mr. Marvin in his letter to you.

Your constituent makes four major points. In summary, these involve: (1) the short period of time elapsing between the induction of young men and their becoming casualties; (2) the commitment of the 18-year-old group to battle prior to similar commitment of older men who have been in the service for several years; (3) the inadequacy of a 17 weeks' training period for replacements, when compared with the full year of training advocated by the Army for peacetime; and (4) the inference that young men with 17 weeks' training in the United States plus a very short period of overseas training are being organized into units and then, as units, sent into battle.

In the early stages of mobilization, we were able to afford inductees additional training in units after they had completed their basic and specialist training. As mobilization and deployment have progressed, however, our requirements for men to fill new units has steadily decreased until, as the matter now stands, our great need is for replacements to fill ranks depleted by combat. The bulk of these replacements must be trained as infantry, since infantry suffers the heaviest losses in battle. As stated by Mr. Marvin, replacements are normally given basic and specialist training for 17 weeks. This period, followed by a short furlough, processing, and travel to his overseas destination, may result in the arrival of a soldier in a theater of operations within 6 months after the date of his induction. How soon thereafter he enters combat as a replacement in a trained unit depends upon the demands for his services. Obviously, considering the numbers engaged there will be casualties among replacements who have had only 6 months' service.

With regard to Mr. Marvin's statement that "some even not yet graduated from high school" are among those becoming casualties within 6 months after induction, I know you are aware that the War Department has made every effort consistent with the successful prosecution of the war to hold to a minimum the number of 18-year-olds entering combat. Following are extracts of War Department policy in this respect:

"Men less than 19 years of age who have had less than 6 months' training, and pre-Pearl Harbor fathers who have had less than 6 months' training will be used as overseas replacements only after all other replacement resources have been exhausted." (Revision of February 28, 1944.)

"In selecting replacements for shipment overseas, the following order of priority will be observed:

"(1) Those who have attained the age of 19 and are not pre-Pearl Harbor fathers.

"(2) Those pre-Pearl Harbor fathers who have attained the age of 19.

"(3) Those who have not attained age 19. "No infantry or armored replacements will be shipped overseas until they have attained age 19." (Revision of June 24, 1944.)

The foregoing policies were rigorously observed and were continued until their further observance became impossible for military reasons. These reasons were our urgent needs for infantry and armored replacements, needs which developed in early fall of last year and could not be deferred without serious effects on our operations overseas. The Under Secretary of War in a statement to the press on December 7, 1944, clarified the War Department position in this respect. A copy of the press release is enclosed.

Mr. Marvin's second point is that at present young men are getting into the front line sooner than older men who have been

in service several years. The bulk of the men now being received from Selective Service are in the 18- and 19-year-old group. Initially only individuals between the ages of 21 and 38 were inducted, and this age group furnished sufficient personnel to provide the military forces required by our early plans. As the military situation developed, it became apparent that there were not enough men in the older group with the necessary physical stamina to meet requirements fully. It therefore became necessary to draw inductees from a lower age bracket. As a result, the age limit was lowered to include the 18-year-old group. Since this group had not been previously inducted, a high proportion of these individuals was obtained in the months that followed.

Thereafter every effort was made to give young men all possible training before committing them to combat. Divisions not scheduled for early movement overseas were stripped of older men and younger men assigned in their places. With the shift of the bulk of our Army overseas, this process had to be curtailed in mid-1944.

In February 1944 the policy was adopted of not sending men under 19 years of age as replacements for infantry and armored units as long as others were obtainable. This further stiffened in June to bar the sending of any such men. This policy was adhered to as long as military operations permitted. In December 1944, the Army announced a change in policy which permitted the 18-year-old soldier to be sent overseas. This was only one of the actions taken to meet the situation. Another was the withdrawing of some 95,000 physically fit and older men from the Army Air Forces and Army Service Forces for retraining as infantry. The process is in effect overseas as well as in the United States. Overseas commanders are kept fully informed of the amount of training each individual has had before leaving the United States.

The third point under consideration is the adequacy of our replacement training period. Originally, as you know, the replacement training period was 13 weeks. After some time, however, we found it was possible to meet our needs and at the same time increase to 17 weeks this training period. This was continued until very recently, when our replacement demand became so urgent as to require the reduction of the training period to 15 weeks. Carefully worked-out training tests and battle experience have demonstrated that the average soldier in 13 to 17 weeks can be brought to a training level that permits him to fill a vacancy in a trained team. In contrasting the training of units and of replacements, however, it should be understood that a replacement joins a trained organization. He performs acceptably well and learns quickly in combat. He is flanked by men who are experienced. He follows their lead and is guided by their advice.

Mr. Marvin makes a comparison between the training of replacements and the 1-year training period which the Army advocates for peacetime. It is considered that the two are not comparable. It is important to realize that the year's training covers the period necessary for both individual training and the team training and development of leadership required to build such organizations as regiments or divisions. On the other hand, the replacement joins a unit made up of experienced soldiers and benefits from their knowledge and skill for his final training on the job. You will recall that General Marshall explained in the attached letter to you in 1942 the marked disparity between unit training and the training required for replacements.

Lastly, Mr. Marvin infers that replacements with little overseas training are being



sent into battle as units. This is not correct. As explained above, replacements are not formed into new units, but are infiltrated into trained, and for the most part, battle-seasoned organizations.

The War Department appreciates your interest, and if further details are desired, I will be happy to discuss the matter at your convenience.

Faithfully yours,

W. W. IRVINE,  
Brigadier General, G. S. C.,  
Acting Assistant Chief of Staff, G-3.

MARCH 5, 1945.

Hon. WILLIAM HESS,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HESS: I have carefully reviewed your response of February 23 to my letter of the preceding day. As I understand your letter, it raises three major points—first, that the War Department is on record as having assured the Congress that 18-year-olds would receive at least a year's training before going overseas; second, that our present replacement training system does not provide 18-year-olds with adequate military preparation for combat duties; and third, that older and fully trained soldiers here should be used as replacements instead of 18-year-olds.

As for the War Department's previous comments on this subject, the War Department testimony at the hearings you cited unquestionably establishes our position in opposition to a statutory training limitation. I also recall statements by General White, then Chief of the General Staff Personnel Division, that no assurance was possible that soldiers of any age group would receive a minimum of a year's training before proceeding overseas. If you wish, I shall have an officer visit you in your office with a marked copy of the hearings which will reveal the War Department's position to have been that any such restriction on Army training would be impossible of administration. In this connection I do not think it could be maintained that the remarks of Generals Reckord and Devers in 1941, 5 months before our entry into the war, should be accepted as the governing criteria for conducting replacement training at the present time. Both these men are able officers but at that time they were expressing general views of their own and neither one of them was a member of the War Department General Staff. Furthermore, to accept as determining views of this nature expressed at that time would be to ignore all the combat experience we have gained and techniques we have developed during the past 3 years. Also, their remarks were predicated upon the peacetime concept of unit training, not the wartime replacement training to which your correspondence refers. What may be successfully demanded of soldiers in time of peace in the way of training is quite different from what may be required as a matter of course today when they work without regard to hours and accept the hardships without question.

As for the adequacy of our training, the system is based, as I have just indicated above, upon an extensive military experience specifically related to the present war. Furthermore, most of the training is now in the hands of men who have had recent combat experience. In my opinion, the present system is adequate, and I have personally inspected replacement training camp after camp to make certain that the work was being conducted in the most efficient manner practicable. Of course, one must keep in mind that we are training men to be placed in seasoned veteran units where the leadership from the noncommissioned grades upward is in the hands of veterans.

The impression has been developed that there are many other soldiers in continental United States who are available for combat

assignments overseas in lieu of these younger men. The facts will not bear this out. So long as we had divisions in training in this country I required that the younger men graduated from the replacement training camps should be sent to the divisions and the ranks of these units stripped of the privates who had been in training within the divisions for a long period in this country. This procedure was very hard on the divisional team, but it was one way of meeting the public and congressional desire in this matter. Some 140,000 were so assigned and reassigned. However, with the movement of the divisions out of the United States this procedure was no longer possible.

Furthermore, in the effort to provide infantry replacements for assignment overseas at the rates demanded by the heavy fighting, approximately 500,000 men were withdrawn from assignments other than divisional, in the United States, were retrained for infantry duty and sent abroad. In addition we summarily transferred from the air forces and the service forces a total of 90,000 men who were retrained as infantry. We also converted the personnel of units for which there was no longer an urgent requirement into infantry replacement—as, for example, more than 50 battalions of antiaircraft artillery, totaling 40,000 men. For the past 6 months we have been combing the coastal defense commands and our bases in Alaska and the Caribbean for men who are suitable for infantry replacements, they themselves to be replaced by personnel of such physical limitations that they could not be employed in combat service. The same procedure is being followed through all the rear areas in the overseas theaters, yet we are still short in replacements and under the heaviest pressure from our field commanders to obtain them.

The choice in the matter is very clear; either we must accept delays in operations in Europe and in the Pacific or we must follow the present procedure. There is no other course. To delay the operations now under way would, in my opinion, be a tragic error resulting in an inevitably increased loss in life by the prolongation of the war. I am quite certain that the people of the United States would not make this choice. The attached comments of Mr. Stimson to the press on March 1 explain the situation and our efforts to meet it.

I wish to make one further observation. The Secretary of War, Mr. Stimson, and I, and others in responsible places in the War Department, are keenly sensitive to the daily casualties we are suffering. Our constant effort has been so to conduct this war that it can be brought to a successful conclusion with a minimum of American casualties. The greatest economy will be obtained by the early termination of the fighting. We must never give the enemy a moment to recuperate his strength, to regain his balance, and the urgent requirement for replacements, strong and vigorous must be met if we are to be successful.

I shall add this final comment, that I believe that never before in our history have the soldiers in our Army been so carefully prepared for battle as is the case at the present time.

Faithfully yours,

G. C. MARSHALL.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I refer to certain pages of hearings in order to aid my colleagues if they desire to examine testimony bearing upon this amendment. I will give the pages to which they may turn.

In the hearings before the House Committee on Military Affairs I refer to the testimony of Maj. Gen. S. G. Henry, G-1; and Maj. Gen. I. H. Edwards, G-3. General Henry's testimony with regard to figures on calls for men and how they

were being handled may be found at pages 3, 4, 7, and 8. General Edwards' testimony explaining the replacement training program may be found on pages 9 and 10; on page 11, explaining the coming of the Army for suitable infantry replacements; on page 13, stating a shortage of replacements, and explaining that the War Department had never had a policy of training replacements for 12 months.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a memorandum entitled "Why 18-Year-Olds?"

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### WHY 18-YEAR-OLDS?

The supply of manpower under 26 years of age fit for full military duty is practically exhausted, including men in the armed forces not in combat units. The men becoming 18 years of age each month constitute practically the entire source of additional manpower.

While the need of young men for the Air Force, if it is to be an efficient fighting unit, is universally recognized, few outside trained military men understand that the same requirement applies to the Infantry and that if older men are used for Infantry replacements it will slow down the speed of attack, prolong the war, and increase total casualties.

After VE-day a steady flow of the younger men will be required to permit release of men whose service in Europe has earned it for them and at the same time permit the rapid and vigorous prosecution of the war against Japan.

A restriction on the use of 18-year-olds in battle will slow down operations, increase casualties, and prevent release of battle-worn veterans after VE-day.

Had the War Department been restricted in the use of 18-year-olds in combat during the last 9 months, the offensive in Europe could not have been sustained at its rapid pace, which prevented the enemy from reorganizing and establishing new defensive lines which would have materially prolonged the campaign in Germany with a resultant heavy increase in casualties. Use of 18-year-old trained soldiers was essential in maintaining the combat divisions at effective combat strength since there were not sufficient physically fit men of other ages suitable for infantry work available.

The efficiency with which these replacements have functioned and the fact that the offensive power of the combat units absorbing them has not been lowered is convincing proof of the adequacy of their training.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I wish to give the correct title of those hearings. They were held on March 22, 1945, before the Committee on Military Affairs of the House of Representatives on H. R. 2625, an act extending the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, it has been my belief that under the able leadership of General Marshall every opportunity has been granted, wherever possible, to afford sufficient training to men inducted into the armed services. I believe this country has been most fortunate in the great military leadership of Gen. George C. Marshall. Earlier today I spoke on the subject of the training of the One Hundred and Sixth Division. For the RECORD I read a statement of the War Department submitted to me by the clerk of the Committee on Military Af-

fairs at my request only a few moments ago:

The One Hundred and Sixty Infantry Division was activated March 15, 1943, and left Army ground forces jurisdiction (in order to go overseas) October 9, 1944.

The One Hundred and Sixteenth Infantry Regiment which is part of the Twenty-ninth Infantry Division, a National Guard organization with Maryland, etc., troops, was inducted in February 1941 and trained in this country until September 1942.

#### G. I. REPRESENTATION AT SAN FRANCISCO CONFERENCE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, a great deal has been said today regarding our G. I.'s. I have long advocated that at the coming Conference to be held at San Francisco some adequate representation be given the G. I. Several days before the departure of our late lamented President for Warm Springs I had the good fortune to talk with him. Among other things, we talked about the G. I. representation at the peace conference. He told me that he was giving the matter serious consideration. He said, however, that what bothered him—and it is what bothers many of us—was how to select the typical G. I. We now have a new President in the White House. I think that perhaps he is also perplexed by the question of how to select the typical G. I.

Mr. President, many persons will attend the San Francisco Conference. At least, many will go to San Francisco. I understand the American Legion will be represented there. The Veterans of Foreign Wars, and other types of permanent organizations of this country, will endeavor to be represented at San Francisco. They will at least be there on the fringes.

A Senator said to me today, "We have a G. I. representative in the person of the ex-Governor of the State of Minnesota." But, Mr. President, he is not the type of G. I. of whom I am thinking. He is just like the Senator who is now speaking; he was a brass hat in the Navy, as I was a brass hat. I am thinking about the typical G. I.

I believe that I have a solution of the difficulty. I suggest to the President of the United States the following method: Let the staff of the Stars and Stripes, or its editor, draw up a standard of qualifications for the man who shall sit at the peace table as the representative of the G. I.'s. Representatives of the Army and Navy may then draw 50 names from the complete list of those who are in the armed services, using the same machinery that was used when the men were drafted. Let those names then be published in the Stars and Stripes, and from it let the staff pick the enlisted man best qualified for the assignment. The staff of the Stars and Stripes is composed wholly of noncommissioned officers. This method, Mr. President, will assure that every man in the armed forces will have an opportunity to be chosen to represent the G. I.'s, provided he fulfills certain minimum qualifications. It will also allow the men to understand that the selection was not an arbitrary one, and that each man in the armed forces had as good a chance to be selected as any other man. I be-

lieve the effect of this procedure would contribute much to the success of the coming San Francisco Conference. It is still not too late to follow this procedure, even though the Conference will begin some time next week.

DAVID B. SMITH

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 209) for the relief of David B. Smith, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. ELLENDER. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. O'DANIEL, and Mr. MORSE conferees on the part of the Senate.

KATHERINE SMITH

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1567) for the relief of Katherine Smith, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. ELLENDER. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. TUNNELL, and Mr. WILSON conferees on the part of the Senate.

#### CONTINENTAL CASUALTY CO., A CORPORATION, AND MONTGOMERY CITY LINES, INC.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its agreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1307) for the relief of Continental Casualty Co., a corporation, and Montgomery City Lines, Inc., and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. ELLENDER. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. TAYLOR, and Mr. WILEY conferees on the part of the Senate.

#### PROGRAM TOMORROW

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, it is obvious we cannot conclude the consideration of the pending measure today. I express the hope that we may do so tomorrow. I have the assurance of Senators on both sides of the aisle, and on both sides of the pending question, that they will cooperate in an attempt to conclude the bill tomorrow. I desire to avoid a session Saturday, if possible.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of the Senate proceedings.)

#### CONFIRMATION OF POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT NOMINATION

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, as in executive session, that the one nomination on the Executive Calendar be considered and disposed of.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the nomination.

#### POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Harrison Parkman to be purchasing agent for the Post Office Department.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed, and, without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

#### RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 51 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, April 20, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 19 (legislative day of April 16), 1945:

##### DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Spruille Braden, of New York, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Cuba, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Argentina.

##### SUPERINTENDENT OF THE MINT

Neal H. Callaghan, of San Francisco, Calif., to be Superintendent of the Mint of the United States at San Francisco, Calif., to fill an existing vacancy.

##### POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

##### ALABAMA

W. Cliff Crump, Collinsville, Ala., in place of J. P. Cox, deceased.

Oscar P. Braswell, Delta, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Arthur G. Finch, Red Bay, Ala., in place of S. W. Wren, transferred.

Samuel Henry Dalley, Tunnel Springs, Ala. Office became Presidential October 1, 1944.

##### ARIZONA

Herman J. Kiehorn, Williams, Ariz., in place of J. L. Boyce, resigned.

##### ARKANSAS

Dudley B. Hutchinson, Ashdown, Ark., in place of M. H. Morgan, resigned.

Gordon O. Thomasson, Magazine, Ark., in place of R. L. Cummings, resigned.

##### CALIFORNIA

Floyd V. Wike, Bryte, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Logan P. White, Lancaster, Calif., in place of L. C. Rowe, deceased.

Thomas S. Powell, Orosi, Calif., in place of W. A. Oxford, deceased.



Robert A. Bates, Roseville, Calif., in place of M. H. Wiswell, resigned.  
 Elsie R. Wiseman, Standard, Calif., in place of Henry Mendes, deceased.  
 Bonnie F. Rodenbaugh, Winterhaven, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.  
 Maxwell F. Buffum, Yreka, Calif., in place of R. H. DeWitt, Jr., resigned.

## CONNECTICUT

William J. Foran, Plainville, Conn., in place of J. T. McCarthy, resigned.

## GEORGIA

Mattie K. Pollard, Appling, Ga., in place of F. L. Crawford, deceased.  
 Jeremiah B. Monk, Moultrie, Ga., in place of Grady Adams, resigned.  
 Agnes R. Mundy, Rockmart, Ga., in place of D. G. Burnette, resigned.  
 Isaac Y. Conger, Tifton, Ga., in place of Roy Thrasher, transferred.  
 Urvie W. Busby, Villa Rica, Ga., in place of F. S. Pope, resigned.

## IDAHO

Maye Burns, Osburn, Idaho. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

## ILLINOIS

Harold Klinke, Alton, Ill., in place of J. L. Lampert. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.  
 Victoria J. Ksycki, Dubois, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.  
 Woodrow W. Hynous, Fox River Grove, Ill., in place of J. J. Zeman, retired.  
 Blanche Nelder, Godfrey, Ill., in place of R. R. Pattison, deceased.  
 Verna M. Boal, Hillside, Ill., in place of J. R. Maher, resigned.  
 Foy I. Smith, Joy, Ill., in place of L. O. Kistler, transferred.  
 Horace E. Hipkins, Liberty, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.  
 Edwin H. Barmore, Winfield, Ill., in place of W. B. Daleiden, resigned.

## INDIANA

Eva A. Thompson, Chesterfield, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.  
 Ferd B. Koenig, Etna Green, Ind., in place of J. N. Hight, transferred.  
 James W. Shafor, Frankfort, Ind., in place of W. G. Thomas. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.  
 Leslie C. Weigle, Fremont, Ind., in place of E. V. Myers, transferred.  
 Nellie K. Kownover, Granger, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.  
 Bernard H. McCann, Lawrenceburg, Ind., in place of Albert Spanagel, retired.  
 Fred M. Hoppas, Sidney, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

## IOWA

George E. Bowers, Alton, Iowa, in place of E. J. Kooreman, resigned.  
 George W. Oelke, Audubon, Iowa, in place of H. A. Northup, resigned.  
 Glen W. Irwin, Bedford, Iowa, in place of Eunice Hamilton, removed.  
 Gerald L. Fickel, Glenwood, Iowa, in place of A. J. Belt, resigned.  
 Glenn W. Brammer, Grand River, Iowa, in place of E. H. Gilreath, resigned.  
 J. Burnham Sitsly, Lamoni, Iowa, in place of W. H. Blair, resigned.  
 Homer L. Casey, Lineville, Iowa, in place of P. M. Molleston, resigned.

## KANSAS

Mildred M. Beach, Elwood, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.  
 Mary D. Haring, Latham, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.  
 William H. Guthrie, Jr., Leon, Kans., in place of C. C. Doughty, transferred.  
 Paul Wayne Kirkpatrick, Marysville, Kans., in place of H. M. Brodrick, retired.  
 Charles W. Horak, Munden, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Vera M. Lapsley, Prescott, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.  
 Ethel M. Gough, Sharon Springs, Kans., in place of A. L. Hicks, resigned.

## KENTUCKY

Anna H. Render, McHenry, Ky., in place of E. E. Warren, deceased.  
 B. Bates, North Middletown, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.  
 Harry C. Thomas, Owenton, Ky., in place of D. L. Johnson, resigned.  
 Jessie Mitchell, Salem, Ky., in place of J. H. Mitchell, deceased.

## LOUISIANA

Charles A. Batton, Dubberly, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.  
 Robert W. Human, Sulphur, La., in place of J. F. Ellis, resigned.  
 Louis A. Dubreuil, Marrero, La., in place of Olivier Dufour, resigned.  
 Roy M. Taylor, Winnboro, La., in place of N. D. Womble, deceased.

## MAINE

Ida M. Packard, Bethel, Maine, in place of A. E. Herrick, resigned.  
 Evariste A. Chenard, Chisholm, Maine, in place of A. J. Dupont, removed.  
 Margaret I. Colby, Coopers Mills, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

## MASSACHUSETTS

Stephen A. Boland, Andover, Mass., in place of J. H. McDonald, retired.

## MICHIGAN

John B. Springhetti, Bessemer, Mich., in place of S. C. Camilli, removed.  
 Helen M. Verplanck, Edmore, Mich., in place of B. L. Verplanck, resigned.  
 Blanche C. Papineau, Ensign, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.  
 Lyman J. Telfer, Henderson, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.  
 Bessie M. Cubalo, Lincoln, Mich., in place of E. V. Adair, resigned.

## MINNESOTA

Shirley M. Anderson, Evan, Minn., in place of Frede Westergaard, retired.  
 Mildred A. Olson, Harris, Minn., in place of I. G. Martinson, resigned.  
 Jay P. Mortenson, Lyle, Minn., in place of N. E. Fedson, deceased.

## MISSISSIPPI

Elvas V. Shove, Biloxi, Miss., in place of J. R. Meunier, retired.  
 Bessie D. Corban, Fayette, Miss., in place of Ulabelle Lehmann, resigned.  
 Wyatt W. Curtis, French Camp, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.  
 Agnes E. Olivier, Mississippi City, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.  
 Albert E. McGee, Wesson, Miss., in place of G. A. Decell, transferred.

## MISSOURI

Geraldine T. Johnson, Ash Grove, Mo., in place of Fred Hulston, transferred.  
 Roy F. Irvin, Festus, Mo., in place of M. H. Dreyer, removed.  
 Cordie Opal Price, Green Castle, Mo., in place of I. N. Knowles, transferred.  
 Jesse J. Ayer, Lancaster, Mo., in place of L. E. Barnett, deceased.  
 David M. Weems, Neosho, Mo., in place of R. S. Kenney, removed.  
 Hazel A. Pollock, Powersville, Mo., in place of C. R. Ethington, transferred.

## NEBRASKA

Samuel Broekema, Hickman, Nebr. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.  
 Genevieve W. Pilkington, Wallace, Nebr., in place of Lula Newman, resigned.

## NEVADA

Ruth L. Adair, Panaca, Nev., in place of M. E. Bauer, resigned.

## NEW HAMPSHIRE

Raymond L. Jenkins, Reeds Ferry, N. H. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.  
 Benning W. Noyes, Salem Depot, N. H., in place of D. E. Stevens, resigned.

## NEW JERSEY

Joseph Bearlepp, Bernardsville, N. J., in place of Jane Jolliffe, resigned.  
 John J. McMinn, Butler, N. J., in place of R. B. Kinney, removed.  
 Louis E. Burkhardt, East Millstone, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.  
 Lealutard L. Bignell, Elmer, N. J., in place of E. H. Wheatley, resigned.  
 Laura L. Ware, Glassboro, N. J., in place of C. L. Ware, resigned.  
 Walter C. Battle, Monroeville, N. J., in place of J. C. Wiltsee, deceased.  
 Helen M. Phelan, Wayne, N. J., in place of A. C. Kelleher, resigned.

## NEW MEXICO

Margaret G. Mellichampe, Monista, N. Mex. Office became Presidential January 1, 1945.

## NEW YORK

Fred R. Chandler, East Williamson, N. Y., in place of I. B. Ameele, resigned.  
 Edward T. Sheehan, Grand Island, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.  
 Maybelle A. Wilber, Hillsdale, N. Y., in place of G. J. Petith, resigned.  
 Orrin B. Brockway, Hobart, N. Y., in place of N. G. Squires. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1939.  
 Mildred E. Hermanns, Holbrook, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.  
 John J. Bennett, Westbury, N. Y., in place of Charles O'Connor, resigned.

## NORTH CAROLINA

Marlin Grady Bishop, Browns Summit, N. C., in place of L. L. Troxler, retired.  
 Willie E. McGoogan, Lumber Bridge, N. C., in place of S. E. Cobb, retired.  
 Lucy A. Williamson, Turkey, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

## NORTH DAKOTA

Ischem G. Williams, Dunseith, N. Dak., in place of Francis Higgins, resigned.  
 Alvin N. Anderson, Marion, N. Dak., in place of Cleo Flugga. Incumbent's commission expired August 19, 1941.

## OHIO

Mahla E. Stafford, Caledonia, Ohio, in place of H. J. Kightlinger, transferred.  
 David F. Mayer, Harrod, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.  
 Elizabeth E. Lennex, Millbury, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.  
 William Corrigan, Morrow, Ohio, in place of Everett Bennett, transferred.  
 Mae H. Jones, South Point, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.  
 Lillian M. Dreescher, Terrace Park, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.  
 Helen Santulla, Washingtonville, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

## OKLAHOMA

Green B. Combs, Owasso, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

## OREGON

Josephine M. Hogue, Grass Valley, Oreg., in place of I. D. Pike, retired.  
 Bessie K. Gardner, Huntington, Oreg., in place of J. W. Bubb, resigned.

## PENNSYLVANIA

Grace Malley Ward, Bairdford, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.  
 Carl W. Heckert, Bakerstown, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.  
 Florence J. Blier, Bobtown, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.  
 Virgie Yasosky, Hannastown, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.  
 Irene McKay, Larimer, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Rose O. Cortez, Leisenring, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Anne G. Byron, McGrann, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Helen K. Griffin, Waverly, Pa., in place of C. W. Carpenter, resigned.

Howard L. Parsons, Westfield, Pa., in place of H. B. Davis. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Walter D. Butz, Breinigsville, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Isabel M. Hull, Fort Loudon, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Agnes Campbell DeArmond, Green Ridge, Pa. Office became Presidential January 1, 1945.

B. Dale Dickson, Ingomar, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Frank J. Langan, Jessup, Pa., in place of T. R. Lawler, resigned.

Eula A. Kauffman, New Stanton, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Kenneth W. McIntyre, Sharpsville, Pa., in place of Karl Smith, retired.

#### PUERTO RICO

Carmen Villalobos, Canovanas, P. R. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Rafael Castaneda, Humacao, P. R., in place of M. P. de Velazquez, not commissioned.

Luisa Rodriguez, Naguabo, P. R. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

#### SOUTH CAROLINA

William A. Richbourg, Liberty, S. C., in place of W. A. Richbourg. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

#### TENNESSEE

Roy A. Gilbert, Jackson, Tenn., in place of T. G. Hughes, deceased.

George E. Bowling, Oak Ridge, Tenn. Office became Presidential April 1, 1944.

Clyde J. Mahan, Russellville, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

#### TEXAS

Collier M. Yeury, Howe, Tex., in place of D. P. Slaughter, deceased.

Andrew J. LeRibeus, Angleton, Tex., in place of E. D. Harris, retired.

Louella Elam, Milano, Tex., in place of L. M. Peebles, transferred.

Willie E. Warren, Paint Rock, Tex., in place of J. W. Walde, transferred.

Ward O. Barker, Sulphur Bluff, Tex., in place of G. S. Barker, transferred.

Donald E. Williams, Seagraves, Tex., in place of M. T. Cain, deceased.

#### VERMONT

Edward J. Duzinski, Essex Junction, Vt., in place of A. P. Loneran, removed.

Alice C. FitzSimonds, Underhill, Vt. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

#### VIRGINIA

Cecile B. Thompson, Blairs, Va., in place of B. O. Johnson, retired.

Sarah Ella Kirkland, Bonny Blue, Va., in place of A. B. Lay, resigned.

Edgar C. Michael, Brodnax, Va. Office made Presidential July 1, 1944.

Henry O. Humphrey, Trevilians, Va., in place of O. E. Hancock, retired.

#### WASHINGTON

Clare F. Lee, Colville, Wash., in place of Elliot Curry, resigned.

George A. Bremner, Jr., Lynden, Wash., in place of W. A. Bauman, removed.

#### WEST VIRGINIA

Hugh A. Christie, Everettville, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Lindsey C. Foster, Pennsboro, W. Va., in place of V. L. Connell, resigned.

Ethel N. Tuggle, Peterstown, W. Va., in place of D. G. Miller, resigned.

Fred A. Williams, Princeton, W. Va., in place of J. B. Shrewsbury, resigned.

Jack R. Michael, Prichard, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

#### WISCONSIN

Alice A. McHugh, Holmen, Wis., in place of H. S. Smith, deceased.

John H. Irish, Laona, Wis., in place of W. H. Brown, resigned.

#### CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate April 19 (legislative day of April 16), 1945:

#### POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Harrison Parkman to be purchasing agent for the Post Office Department.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, APRIL 19, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

Rev. Harry E. Brooks, pastor, First Methodist Church of Bainbridge, N. Y., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Creator, Sustainer, Redeemer, for whose life, providence, and fellowship we cannot adequately appreciate or praise Thee, we give Thee thanks for Thy favor to this country since the inception of its history. We thank Thee that out of the ashes of adversity, phoenixlike, we have been brought to new hope, influence, and power. We pray that in the prospect or in the midst of victory we may be humbly reliant on Thee. In the midst of adversity and loss, we pray that we may be exalted through Thy comfort and sustaining grace. Bless Thy servant upon whom has so suddenly been thrust the responsibility of leading this great people. May he be replenished by divine wisdom and courage. Endow, we pray Thee, the officers and Members of this House with wisdom, discretion, and sound judgment which is from above. Bless all the deliberations of this day, and to Thy glorious name shall be praise, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, both in time and eternity. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On April 16, 1945:

H. R. 201. An act for the relief of the Dempsey Industrial Furnace Corporation;

H. R. 206. An act for the relief of St. Vincent's Infirmary and Dr. Alvin W. Strauss;

H. R. 266. An act for the relief of the Southern Bitumen Co., of Ensley, Ala.;

H. R. 990. An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain civilian personnel for personal property lost as a result of the Japanese occupation of Hong Kong and Manila;

H. R. 1094. An act for the relief of the Jay Taylor Cattle Co., Amarillo, Tex.;

H. R. 1344. An act for the relief of George Webb; and

H. R. 2013. An act to extend for 1 year the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941, as amended.

On April 17, 1945:

H. R. 202. An act for the relief of Angelina Bourbeau;

H. R. 510. An act granting to Galveston County, a municipal corporation of the State of Texas, certain easements and rights-of-way over, under, and upon the San Jacinto Military Reservation in Galveston County, Tex.;

H. R. 787. An act for the relief of Murray B. Latimer;

H. R. 791. An act for the relief of H. J. Blehrud estate;

H. R. 807. An act for the relief of Mrs. Wilma Louise Townsend;

H. R. 933. An act for the relief of Margaret G. Potts;

H. R. 945. An act for the relief of Fred Clouse and Mrs. Emily G. Clouse;

H. R. 1012. An act for the relief of A. P. Scarborough and J. D. Ethridge;

H. R. 1079. An act for the relief of Ray L. Smith;

H. R. 1135. An act for the relief of Gus A. Vance;

H. R. 1324. An act for the relief of Leo Edward Day and Phillip Tamborello;

H. R. 1396. An act for the relief of Anne Loacker;

H. R. 1483. An act for the relief of Mrs. W. V. Justice;

H. R. 1492. An act for the relief of Florence J. Syper, administratrix of the estate of Leona Connor Childers;

H. R. 1539. An act for the relief of Dr. David R. Barglow; and

H. R. 1716. An act for the relief of Mrs. Sue B. Bowen, as administratrix of the estate of Clyde Bowen, deceased.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 106. Joint resolution to amend section 5 (k) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, with respect to the deferment of registrants engaged in agricultural occupations or endeavors essential to the war effort.

The message also announced that the President pro tempore has appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of Commerce.
3. Department of the Interior.
4. National Archives.
5. Tennessee Valley Authority.
6. United States Maritime Commission.

#### SMALLER WAR PLANTS CORPORATION

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 105) to extend the life of the Smaller War Plants Corporation.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the bill? I also understand there is a proposed committee amendment. Will the gentleman explain that also?